arXiv:1405.4955v1 [stat.ME] 20 May 2014

Nonstationary, Nonparametric, Nonseparable Bayesian Spatio-Temporal Modeling using Kernel Convolution of Order Based Dependent Dirichlet Process

Moumita Das and Sourabh Bhattacharya*

Abstract

Spatio-temporal processes are important modeling tools for varieties of problems in environmental science, biological science, geographical science, etc. It is generally assumed that the underlying model is parametric, typically a Gaussian process, and that the covariance function is stationarity and separable. That this structure need not be always realistic have been perceived by many researchers and attempts have been made to construct nonparametric processes consisting of neither stationary nor separable covariance functions. But, as we elucidate, some desirable and important spatio-temporal properties are not guaranteed by the existing approaches, thus calling for further innovative ideas.

In this paper, using kernel convolution of order based dependent Dirichlet process (Griffin & Steel (2006)) we construct a nonstationary, nonseparable, nonparametric space-time process, which, as we show, satisfies desirable properties, and includes the stationary, separable, parametric processes as special cases. We also investigate the smoothness properties of our proposed model.

Since our model entails an infinite random series, for Bayesian model fitting purpose we must either truncate the series or more appropriately consider a random number of summands, which renders the model dimension a random variable. We attack the variable dimensionality problem using the novel Transdimensional Transformation based

*Moumita Das is a PhD student and Sourabh Bhattacharya is an Assistant Professor in Bayesian and Interdisciplinary Research Unit, Indian Statistical Institute, 203, B. T. Road, Kolkata 700108. Corresponding e-mail: moumita.statistics@gmail.com.

Markov Chain Monte Carlo (TTMCMC) methodology introduced by Das & Bhattacharya (2014*b*), which can update all the variables and also change dimensions in a single block using a single random variable drawn from some arbitrary density defined on a relevant support. For the sake of completeness we also address the problem of truncating the infinite series by providing a uniform bound on the error incurred by truncating the infinite series.

We illustrate our model and the methodologies on a simulated data set and also fit a real, ozone data set. The results that we obtain from both the studies are quite encouraging.

Keywords: *Kernel convolution; Nonstationary; Nonseparable; Order based Dependent Dirichlet Process; Spatio-temporal data; Transdimensional Transformation based Markov Chain Monte Carlo.*

1. INTRODUCTION

Recent years have witnessed considerable amount of research on spatial and spatio-temporal modeling. Though it is common practice to assume that the underlying spatial or spatio-temporal process is stationary and isotropic Gaussian process, in reality such assumptions seldom hold. This is because there may be local influences affecting the correlation structure of the random process. For instance, orographic effects influence the atmospheric transport of pollutants, and result in a correlation structure that depends on different spatial locations (Guttorp & Sampson (1994)). It is also restrictive to assume that the underlying process is Gaussian, and nonparametric processes seem more reasonable in realistic situations.

Realizing the limitations of stationary parametric processes (almost invariably Gaussian processes) researchers have come up with many novel ideas for constructing nonstationary and/or nonparametric processes. The first significant work in the framework of nonstationary parametric processes is by Sampson & Guttorp (1992), who proposed an approach based on spatial deformation. This work is followed up by Damian, Sampson & Guttorp (2001) and Schmidt & O'Hagan (2003), providing the corresponding Bayesian generalizations. Non-

stationarity has been induced in parametric space-time models by Haas (1995) by proposing a moving window regression residual kriging. A similar approach has been proposed by Nott & Dunsmuir (2002). Higdon (1998) (see also Higdon, Swall & Kern (1999), Higdon (2001)) proposed a kernel convolution approach for inducing nonstationarity in Gaussian processes. Similar approaches are also proposed by Fuentes & Smith (2001) and Fuentes (2002). Approaches that attempt to model the underlying process as nonparametric, in addition to modeling the covariance structure as nonstationary are more recent in comparison, the approach of Gelfand, Kottas & MacEachern (2005) based on Dirichlet processes (see, for example, Ferguson (1973), Ferguson (1974)) being the first in this regard; see Duan, Guindani & Gelfand (2007) for a generalization. Duan, Gelfand & Sirmans (2009) use stochastic differential equations to construct a nonstationary, non-Gaussian process. We discuss these proposals in some detail in Section 2.

Griffin & Steel (2006) (henceforth, GS) proposed novel order-based dependent Dirichlet processes (ODDP that satisfy most desirable properties of nonparametric processes, and can be seen as a significant improvement over the other existing ideas. Indeed, our modeling idea also hinges upon the constructive idea of GS, but we attempt to incorporate further flexibility in our spatial/temporal/spatio-temporal model in terms of nonstationarity and nonseparability through our proposed kernel convolution based methodology.

The rest of our paper is structured as follows. In Section 2 we provide a brief overview of the existing approaches to construction of nonstationary, nonseparable space-time processes in both parametric and nonparametric frameworks, arguing that not all desirable properties are necessarily accounted for in these approaches. Such issues necessitate development of new approaches to construction of nonstationary, nonparametric, nonseparable space-time models. In Section 3 we introduce our proposed space-time model based on kernel convolution of ODDP and show that it satisfies the properties that are not guaranteed by the existing models. We investigate continuity and smoothness properties of our model in Section 4. Since our proposed model involves a random infinite series, for model fitting one needs to either truncate the series or assume a random number of summands and adopt

variable dimensional Markov Chain Monte Carlo (MCMC) approaches. Although we adopt the latter framework for our applications, and implement the recently developed Transdimensional Transformation based Markov Chain Monte Carlo (TTMCMC) (Das & Bhattacharya (2014*b*)) for simulating from our variable dimensional model, for the sake of completeness we also investigate the truncation approach. Indeed, in Section 5 we consider the difference between the prior predictive models with and without truncation of the random infinite series, providing a bound that depends upon the truncation parameter. Thus, the truncation parameter can be chosen so that the bound falls below any desired level. In Section 6 we discuss the choice of suitable kernels, prior distributions and choice of the spatio-temporal domain that is relevant for computational purpose. We describe the joint posterior distribution associated with our model, and provide a brief discussion of TTMCMC in Section 7. We detail a simulation study illustrating the performance of our model in Section 8, and follow it up by analysis of a real, ozone data set in Section 9. Finally, we summarize our contributions and provide concluding remarks in Section 10.

Proofs of our results and requisite details of TTMCMC, particularly in the context of our spatio-temporal model, are provided in the supplement Das & Bhattacharya (2014*a*), whose sections and algorithms have the prefix "S-" when referred to in this paper.

2. OVERVIEW OF OTHER AVAILABLE NONSTATIONARY APPROACHES

2.1 Parametric approaches

The deformation approaches of Sampson & Guttorp (1992), Damian et al. (2001), and Schmidt & O'Hagan (2003) are based on Gaussian processes. In these approaches replications of the data are necessary, which the authors relate to temporal independence of the data. This also means that space-time data can not be modeled using these approaches. Moreover, in the deformation-based approaches model based theoretical correlations between random observations separated by large enough distances need not necessarily tend to zero.

Sampson & Guttorp (1992) deal with the variogram of the following form:

$$\text{Var}(Y(\boldsymbol{s}_1, t) - Y(\boldsymbol{s}_2, t)) = f(\|\boldsymbol{d}(\boldsymbol{x}_1) - \boldsymbol{d}(\boldsymbol{x}_2)\|), \tag{2.1}$$

for any $\boldsymbol{s}_1, \boldsymbol{s}_2, t$, where f is an appropriate monotone function and $\boldsymbol{d}$ is a one-to-one nonlinear mapping. The technique of Sampson & Guttorp (1992) involves appropriately approximating f by $\hat{f}$ using the multidimensional scaling method, and obtaining a configuration of points $\{\boldsymbol{u}_1, \ldots, \boldsymbol{u}_n\}$ in a "deformed" space where the process is assumed isotropic. Then, using thin-plate splines, a nonlinear approximation of $\boldsymbol{d}$, which we denote by $\hat{\boldsymbol{d}}$, is determined such that $\hat{\boldsymbol{d}}(\boldsymbol{s}_i) \approx \boldsymbol{u}_i$, for $i = 1, \ldots, n$. Bayesian versions of the key idea have been described in Damian et al. (2001), who use random thin-plate splines and Schmidt & O'Hagan (2003), who use Gaussian process to implement the nonlinear transformation $\boldsymbol{d}$. Rather than estimate f nonparametrically, both specify a parametric functional form from a valid class of such monotone functions.

As is clear, since large differences $\|\boldsymbol{s}_1 - \boldsymbol{s}_2\|$ does not imply that $\|\boldsymbol{d}(\boldsymbol{s}_1) - \boldsymbol{d}(\boldsymbol{s}_2)\|$ is also large, the model based correlations between two observations widely separated need not necessarily tend to zero, in either of the aforementioned deformation-based approaches.

The kernel convolution approaches of Higdon et al. (1999), Higdon (2001), and Fuentes & Smith (2001) overcome some of the difficulties of the deformation approach. In these approaches data replication is not necessary, and for appropriate choices of the kernel, stationarity, nonstationarity, separability, and nonseparability can be achieved with respect to spatio-temporal data. In the approach of Higdon et al. (1999), Higdon (2001),

$$Y(\boldsymbol{x}) = \int K(\boldsymbol{x}, \boldsymbol{u}) Z(\boldsymbol{u}) d\boldsymbol{u}, \tag{2.2}$$

where K is a kernel function and $Z(\cdot)$ is a white noise process. Then the covariance between $Y(\boldsymbol{x}_1)$ and $Y(\boldsymbol{x}_2)$ is given by

$$C(\boldsymbol{x}_1, \boldsymbol{x}_2) = \int K(\boldsymbol{x}_1, \boldsymbol{u}) K(\boldsymbol{x}_2, \boldsymbol{u}) d\boldsymbol{u}. \tag{2.3}$$

In general, this does not depend upon $\boldsymbol{x}_1$ and $\boldsymbol{x}_2$ only through $d = \|\boldsymbol{x}_1 - \boldsymbol{x}_2\|$, thus achieving nonstationarity. However, it is clear from the covariance structure (2.3) that $C(\boldsymbol{x}_1, \boldsymbol{x}_2)$ does

not generally tend to zero as $d = \|\boldsymbol{x}_1 - \boldsymbol{x}_2\| \to \infty$. But for separable space-time processes related to representation (2.2) this property holds under the additonal assumption of isotropy with respect to either space or time. We elaborate this below.

Although respresentation (2.2) can not achieve separability with respect to space and time, a modified representation of the following form does:

$$Y(\boldsymbol{s}, t) = \int K_1(\boldsymbol{s}, \boldsymbol{u}) K_2(t, \boldsymbol{v}) Z_1(\boldsymbol{u}) Z_2(\boldsymbol{v}) d\boldsymbol{u} d\boldsymbol{v}. \tag{2.4}$$

In (2.4), K_1, K_2 are two kernel functions, and $Z_1(\boldsymbol{x}), Z_2(\boldsymbol{x})$ are independent white noise processes. Now the covariance is given by

$$\begin{aligned} C((\boldsymbol{s}_1, t_1), (\boldsymbol{s}_2, t_2)) &= \int K_1(\boldsymbol{s}_1, \boldsymbol{u}) K_1(\boldsymbol{x}_s, \boldsymbol{u}) K_2(t_1, \boldsymbol{v}) K_2(t_2, \boldsymbol{v}) d\boldsymbol{u} d\boldsymbol{v} \\ &= C_1(\boldsymbol{s}_1, \boldsymbol{s}_2) \times C_2(t_1, t_2), \end{aligned} \tag{2.5}$$

where

$$C_1(\boldsymbol{s}_1, \boldsymbol{s}_2) = \int K_1(\boldsymbol{s}_1, \boldsymbol{u}) K_1(\boldsymbol{s}_2, \boldsymbol{u}) d\boldsymbol{u}, \tag{2.6}$$

$$C_2(t_1, t_2) = \int K_2(t_1, \boldsymbol{v}) K_2(t_2, \boldsymbol{v}) d\boldsymbol{v}, \tag{2.7}$$

exhibiting separability. Further assuming that either of C_1 or C_2 is isotropic, it follows that if either of $d_1 = \|\boldsymbol{s}_1 - \boldsymbol{s}_2\|$ or $d_2 = |t_1 - t_2|$ tends to infinity, the covariance given by (2.5) tends to zero even though either of C_1 or C_2 is nonstationary. But if both C_1 and C_2 are nonstationary, then this result need not hold.

The approach of Fuentes & Smith (2001) comes close towards solving the problem of zero covariance in the limit with large enough separation between observations, which we now explain. They model the underlying process as

$$Y(\boldsymbol{x}) = \int K(\boldsymbol{x} - \boldsymbol{u}) Z_{\boldsymbol{\theta}(\boldsymbol{u})} d\boldsymbol{u}, \tag{2.8}$$

where $Z_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\boldsymbol{x}); \boldsymbol{x} \in D$ is a family of independent, stationary Gaussian processes indexed by $\boldsymbol{\theta}$, where the covariance of $Z_{\boldsymbol{\theta}(\boldsymbol{u})}$ is given by

$$\text{Cov}\left(Z_{\boldsymbol{\theta}(\boldsymbol{u})}(\boldsymbol{x}_1), Z_{\boldsymbol{\theta}(\boldsymbol{u})}(\boldsymbol{x}_2)\right) = C_{\boldsymbol{\theta}(\boldsymbol{u})}(\boldsymbol{x}_1 - \boldsymbol{x}_2). \tag{2.9}$$

Then, the covariance between $Y(\boldsymbol{x}_1)$ and $Y(\boldsymbol{x}_2)$ is given by

$$C(\boldsymbol{x}_1, \boldsymbol{x}_2; \boldsymbol{\theta}) = \int K(\boldsymbol{x}_1 - \boldsymbol{u}) K(\boldsymbol{x}_2 - \boldsymbol{u}) C_{\boldsymbol{\theta}(\boldsymbol{u})}(\boldsymbol{x}_1 - \boldsymbol{x}_2) d\boldsymbol{u}. \tag{2.10}$$

For practical purposes, Fuentes & Smith (2001) approximate $Y(\boldsymbol{x})$ with

$$\hat{Y}(\boldsymbol{x}) = \frac{1}{M} \sum_{m=1}^{M} K(\boldsymbol{x} - \boldsymbol{u}_m) Z_{\boldsymbol{\theta}(\boldsymbol{u}_m)}(\boldsymbol{x}), \tag{2.11}$$

and $C(\boldsymbol{x}_1, \boldsymbol{x}_2; \boldsymbol{\theta})$ by

$$\hat{C}(\boldsymbol{x}_1, \boldsymbol{x}_2; \boldsymbol{\theta}) = \frac{1}{M} \sum_{m=1}^{M} K(\boldsymbol{x}_1 - \boldsymbol{u}_m) K(\boldsymbol{x}_2 - \boldsymbol{u}_m) C_{\boldsymbol{\theta}(\boldsymbol{u}_m)}(\boldsymbol{x}_1 - \boldsymbol{x}_2), \tag{2.12}$$

where $\{\boldsymbol{u}_1, \ldots, \boldsymbol{u}_M\}$ can be thought of as a set of locations drawn independently from the domain D. Assuming that the family of independent Gaussian processes $Z_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\boldsymbol{x}); \boldsymbol{x} \in D$ is also isotropic, it follows, using the fact that M is finite, that $\hat{C}(\boldsymbol{x}_1, \boldsymbol{x}_2; \boldsymbol{\theta}) \to 0$ as $\|\boldsymbol{x}_1 - \boldsymbol{x}_2\| \to \infty$ since $C_{\boldsymbol{\theta}(\boldsymbol{u}_m)}(\boldsymbol{x}_1 - \boldsymbol{x}_2) \to 0$ for each $m = 1, \ldots, M$. However, this of course does not guarantee that $\hat{C}(\boldsymbol{x}_1, \boldsymbol{x}_2; \boldsymbol{\theta}) \to 0$ as $M \to \infty$. That is, this does not necesasrily imply that $C(\boldsymbol{x}_1, \boldsymbol{x}_2; \boldsymbol{\theta}) \to 0$.

A nonstationary process has been constructed by Chang, Hsu & Huang (2011), by representing the underlying process as a linear combination of basis functions and stationary Gaussian processes. This approach also does not guarantee that the correlation tends to zero if $\|\boldsymbol{x}_1 - \boldsymbol{x}_2\| \to \infty$. For other available parametric approaches to nonstationarity we refer to the references provided in Chang et al. (2011).

2.2 Nonparametric approaches

Gelfand et al. (2005) seem to be the first to propose a nonstationary, noparametric Bayesian model based on Dirichlet process mixing. They represent the random field $\boldsymbol{Y}_D = \{Y(\boldsymbol{x}); \boldsymbol{x} \in D\}$ as $\sum_{\ell=1}^{\infty} w_\ell \delta_{\boldsymbol{\theta}_{\ell,D}}$, where $\boldsymbol{\theta}_{\ell,D} = \{\theta_\ell(\boldsymbol{x}); \boldsymbol{x} \in D\}$ are realizations from a specified stationary Gaussian process, which we denote as $\boldsymbol{G}_0$, $w_1 = V_1$, $w_\ell = V_\ell \prod_{r=1}^{\ell-1}(1 - V_r)$ for $\ell \geq 2$, where $V_r \overset{iid}{\sim} Beta(1, \alpha)$; $r = 1, 2, \ldots$. Thus, a random process $\boldsymbol{G}$ is induced on the space of processes of $\boldsymbol{Y}_D$ with $\boldsymbol{G}_0$ being the "central" process. Gelfand et al. (2005) assume the

space-time data $\boldsymbol{Y}_t = (Y(\boldsymbol{s}_1, t), \ldots, Y(\boldsymbol{s}_n, t))'$ to be time-independent for $t = 1, \ldots, T$, which is the same assumption of data replication used in the deformation-based approaches. The temporal-independence assumption allows Gelfand et al. (2005) to model the data as follows: for $t = 1, \ldots, T$, $\boldsymbol{Y}_t \overset{iid}{\sim} \boldsymbol{G}^{(n)}$ and $\boldsymbol{G}^{(n)} \sim DP(\boldsymbol{G}_0^{(n)})$, where the $\boldsymbol{G}^{(n)}$ and $\boldsymbol{G}_0^{(n)}$ denote the n-variate distributions corresponding to the processes $\boldsymbol{G}$ and $\boldsymbol{G}_0$. The development leads to the following covariance structure: for any $\boldsymbol{s}_1, \boldsymbol{s}_2, t$,

$$\mathrm{Cov}(Y(\boldsymbol{s}_1, t), Y(\boldsymbol{s}_2, t) \mid \boldsymbol{G}) = \sum_{\ell=1}^{\infty} w_\ell \theta_\ell(\boldsymbol{s}_1)\theta_\ell(\boldsymbol{s}_2) - \left\{\sum_{\ell=1}^{\infty} w_\ell \theta_\ell(\boldsymbol{s}_1)\right\}\left\{\sum_{\ell=1}^{\infty} w_\ell \theta_\ell(\boldsymbol{s}_2)\right\}, \quad (2.13)$$

which is nonstationary. However, marginalized over $\boldsymbol{G}$, the covariance between $Y(\boldsymbol{s}_1, t)$ and $Y(\boldsymbol{s}_2, t)$ turns out to be stationary. Since, in Gelfand et al. (2005), the Bayesian inference of the data $\boldsymbol{Y}_1, \ldots, \boldsymbol{Y}_n$ proceeds by integrating out $\boldsymbol{G}^{(n)}$, the entire flavour of nonstationarity is lost. Also, given $\boldsymbol{G}$, (2.13) is nonstationary but need not necessarily converge to zero if $\|\boldsymbol{s}_1 - \boldsymbol{s}_2\| \to \infty$.

Duan et al. (2007) attempt to generalize the model of Gelfand et al. (2005) by specifying

$$Pr\{Y(\boldsymbol{x}_1) \in A_1, \ldots, Y(\boldsymbol{x}_n) \in A_n\} = \sum_{i_1=1}^{\infty} \cdots \sum_{i_n=1}^{\infty} p_{i_1,\ldots,i_n} \delta_{\theta_{i_1}(\boldsymbol{x}_1)}(A_1) \cdots \delta_{\theta_{i_n}(\boldsymbol{x}_n)}(A_n), \quad (2.14)$$

where $\boldsymbol{\theta}_j$'s are iid $\boldsymbol{G}_0$ as in Gelfand et al. (2005), and $\{p_{i_1,\ldots,i_n} \geq 0 : \sum_{i_1=1}^{\infty} \cdots \sum_{i_n=1}^{\infty} p_{i_1,\ldots,i_n}\}$ determine the site-specific joint selection probabilities, which also must satisfy simple constraints to ensure consistency. The resulting conditional covariance (conditional on $\boldsymbol{G}$) and the marginal covariance are somewhat modified versions of those of Gelfand et al. (2005), but now even the marginal covariance is nonstationary. By choosing $\boldsymbol{G}_0$ to be an isotropic Gaussian process it can be ensured that the marginal covariance tends to zero as two observations are widely separated, but the same can not be ensured for the conditional covariance. Moreover, replications of the data is necesary even for this generalized version of Gelfand et al. (2005), and modeling temporal dependence is precluded as before.

A nonstationary, nonseparable non-Gaussian spatiotemporal process has been constructed by Duan et al. (2009) using discretized versions of stochastic differential equations, but again, the correlations between largely separated observations do not necessarily tend to zero un-

der their model. Also, stationarity or separability can not be derived as special cases of this approach.

A flexible approach using kernel convolution of Lévy random measures has been detailed in Wolpert, Clyde & Tu (2011), but even this approach does not guarantee that correlations tend to zero for largely separated distances for arbitrarily chosen kernels.

In the next section we introduce our idea based on kernel convolution of ODDP and show that it overcomes the issues faced by the traditional approaches to construction of flexible space-time models.

3. KERNEL CONVOLUTION OF ODDP

Before introducing our proposal, it is necesary to first provide an overview of ODDP.

3.1 Overview of ODDP

In order to induce spatial dependence between observations at different locations GS modify the nonparametric stick-breaking construction of Sethuraman (1994) in the following way: for each point $\boldsymbol{x} \in D$, where D is some specified domain, they define the distribution:

$$G_{\boldsymbol{x}} \stackrel{\mathcal{D}}{=} \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} p_i(\boldsymbol{x}) \delta_{\boldsymbol{\theta}_{\pi_i(\boldsymbol{x})}}, \tag{3.1}$$

where

$$p_i(\boldsymbol{x}) = V_{\pi_i(\boldsymbol{x})} \prod_{j<i} (1 - V_{\pi_j(\boldsymbol{x})}). \tag{3.2}$$

In (3.1) and (3.2), $\boldsymbol{\pi}(\boldsymbol{x}) = (\pi_1(\boldsymbol{x}), \pi_2(\boldsymbol{x}), \ldots)$ denotes the ordering at $\boldsymbol{x}$, where $\pi_i(\boldsymbol{x}) \in \{1, 2, \ldots\}$ and $\pi_i(\boldsymbol{x}) = \pi_j(\boldsymbol{x})$ if and only if $i = j$. For $j = 1, 2, \ldots$, the parameters $\boldsymbol{\theta}_j \stackrel{iid}{\sim} G_0$, where G_0 is some specified parametric centering distribution, and $V_j \stackrel{iid}{\sim} Beta(1, \alpha)$, where $\alpha > 0$ is a specified parameter. The process associated with specification (3.1) is the ODDP. Clearly, if $\pi_i(\boldsymbol{x}) = i$ for each $\boldsymbol{x}$ and i, then the Dirichlet process (DP) results at all locations.

GS construct $\boldsymbol{\pi}(\boldsymbol{x})$ in a way such that it is associated with the realization of a point process. Specifically, they consider a stationary Poisson process Φ and a sequence of sets $U(\boldsymbol{x})$ for $\boldsymbol{x} \in D$, the latter determining the relevant region for the ordering purpose. In the

case of only spatial problems, if $\boldsymbol{x} \in D \subset \mathbb{R}^d$, for $d \geq 1$, then GS suggest $U(\boldsymbol{x}) = D$ for all $\boldsymbol{x} \in D$ as a suitable construction of $U(\boldsymbol{x})$. For time series problems they suggest $D = \mathbb{R}$ and $U(x) = (-\infty, x]$. When $\boldsymbol{x} = (\boldsymbol{s}', t)'$, that is, when $\boldsymbol{x}$ consists of both spatial and temporal co-ordinates, for our modeling purpose, we use $U(\boldsymbol{x}) = D \times (-\infty, t]$.

Letting $\{\boldsymbol{z}_1, \boldsymbol{z}_2, \ldots\}$ denote a realization of the stationary Poisson point process, the ordering $\boldsymbol{\pi}(\boldsymbol{x})$ is chosen to satisfy $\|\boldsymbol{x} - \boldsymbol{z}_{\pi_1(\boldsymbol{x})}\| < \|\boldsymbol{x} - \boldsymbol{z}_{\pi_2(\boldsymbol{x})}\| < \|\boldsymbol{x} - \boldsymbol{z}_{\pi_3(\boldsymbol{x})}\| < \cdots$, where $\|\cdot\|$ is a distance measure and $\boldsymbol{z}_{\pi(\boldsymbol{x})} \in \Phi \cap U(\boldsymbol{x})$. Thus, although the set of probabilities $\{p_i(\boldsymbol{x}); i = 1, 2, \ldots\}$ remains same for all locations, they are randomly permuted. This random permutation, in turn, induces spatial dependence. Assuming a homogeneous Poisson point process with intensity λ, ODDP is characterized by G_0, α, and λ. We express dependence of ODDP on these parameters by ODDP$(\alpha G_0, \lambda)$.

Assuming that data $\{y_1, \ldots, y_n\}$ are available at sites $\{\boldsymbol{x}_1, \ldots, \boldsymbol{x}_n\}$, GS embed the ODDP in a hierarchical Bayesian model:

$$\begin{aligned} y_i &\sim f_{\boldsymbol{\theta}_i}(\cdot) \\ \boldsymbol{\theta}_i &\overset{iid}{\sim} G_{\boldsymbol{x}_i} \\ G_{\boldsymbol{x}_i} &\sim \text{ODDP}(\alpha G_0, \lambda). \end{aligned}$$

Note that the same theory can be extended to space-time situations with $\boldsymbol{x} = (\boldsymbol{s}', t)'$, where $\boldsymbol{s}$ stands for the spatial location and t stands for the time point.

Next, we introduce our proposed idea of kernel convolution of ODDP.

3.2 Kernel convolution of ODDP

We consider the following model for the data $\boldsymbol{Y} = \{y_1, \ldots, y_n\}$ at locations/times $\{\boldsymbol{x}_i = (\boldsymbol{s}_i', t_i)';\ i = 1, \ldots, n\}$:

$$y_i = f(\boldsymbol{x}_i) + \epsilon_i, \tag{3.3}$$

where $\epsilon_i \overset{iid}{\sim} N(0, \sigma^2)$, for unknown σ^2. We represent the spatio-temporal process $f(\boldsymbol{x})$ as a convolution of ODDP $G_{\boldsymbol{x}}$ with a smoothing kernel $K(\boldsymbol{x}, \cdot)$:

$$f(\boldsymbol{x}) = \int K(\boldsymbol{x}, \boldsymbol{\theta}) dG_{\boldsymbol{x}}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} K(\boldsymbol{x}, \boldsymbol{\theta}_{\pi_i(\boldsymbol{x})}) p_i(\boldsymbol{x}) \ \forall \boldsymbol{x} \in D \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d, \tag{3.4}$$

d (≥ 1) being the dimension of $\boldsymbol{x}$. The following theorem, the proof of which is presented in Section S-1 of the supplement, gives an expression of the expectation of $f(\boldsymbol{x})$.

Theorem 1 *Let* $\int |K(\boldsymbol{x},\boldsymbol{\theta})|dG_0(\boldsymbol{\theta}) < \infty$. *Then* $\int |K(\boldsymbol{x},\boldsymbol{\theta})|dG_{\boldsymbol{x}}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) < \infty$ *with probability one, and*

$$E(f(\boldsymbol{x})) = E\int K(\boldsymbol{x},\boldsymbol{\theta})dG_{\boldsymbol{x}}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \int K(\boldsymbol{x},\boldsymbol{\theta})dEG_{\boldsymbol{x}}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \int K(\boldsymbol{x},\boldsymbol{\theta})dG_0(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = E_{G_0}K(\boldsymbol{x},\boldsymbol{\theta}).$$

Before deriving the covariance structure of $f(\cdot)$, we define the necessary notation following GS. Let

$$T(\boldsymbol{x_1},\boldsymbol{x_2}) = \{k: \text{ there exists } i,j \text{ such that } \pi_i(\boldsymbol{x_1}) = \pi_j(\boldsymbol{x_2}) = k\}.$$

For $k \in T(\boldsymbol{x_1},\boldsymbol{x_2})$, we further define $A_{lk} = \{\pi_j(\boldsymbol{x_l}) : j < i \text{ where } \pi_i(\boldsymbol{x_l}) = k\}$, $S_k = A_{1k} \cap A_{2k}$ and $S_k' = A_{1k} \cup A_{2k} - S_k$. Then, the following theorem, the proof of which is deferred to Section S-2 of the supplement, provides an expression for the covariance structure of $f(\cdot)$, which will be our reference point for arguments regarding nonstationarity and other desirable spatial properties in comparison with the existing methods.

Theorem 2 *If* $\int |K(\boldsymbol{x},\boldsymbol{\theta})|dG_0(\boldsymbol{\theta}) < \infty$ *and* $\int |K(\boldsymbol{x_1},\boldsymbol{\theta})K(\boldsymbol{x_2},\boldsymbol{\theta})|dG_0(\boldsymbol{\theta}) < \infty$, *then for a fixed ordering at* $\boldsymbol{x}_1$ *and* $\boldsymbol{x}_2$,

$$\begin{aligned} Cov(f(\boldsymbol{x_1}), f(\boldsymbol{x_2})) =& Cov_{G_0}(K(\boldsymbol{x_1},\boldsymbol{\theta}), K(\boldsymbol{x_2},\boldsymbol{\theta})) \\ &\times \frac{2}{(\alpha+1)(\alpha+2)} \sum_{k \in T(\boldsymbol{x_1},\boldsymbol{x_2})} \left(\frac{\alpha}{\alpha+2}\right)^{\#S_k} \left(\frac{\alpha}{\alpha+1}\right)^{\#S_k'}. \end{aligned} \tag{3.5}$$

where

$$Cov_{G_0}(K(\boldsymbol{x_1},\boldsymbol{\theta}), K(\boldsymbol{x_2},\boldsymbol{\theta})) = \int K(\boldsymbol{x_1},\boldsymbol{\theta})K(\boldsymbol{x_2},\boldsymbol{\theta})dG_0(\boldsymbol{\theta}) - E_{G_0}(K(\boldsymbol{x_1},\boldsymbol{\theta}))E_{G_0}(K(\boldsymbol{x_2},\boldsymbol{\theta})). \tag{3.6}$$

Corollary 3 *It follows from the above theorem that for* $i = 1, 2$, *if* $\int K^2(\boldsymbol{x}_i,\boldsymbol{\theta})dG_0(\boldsymbol{\theta}) < \infty$, *then*

$$Var(f(\boldsymbol{x}_i)) = \frac{Var_{G_0}(K(\boldsymbol{x}_i,\boldsymbol{\theta}))}{\alpha+1} \tag{3.7}$$

and

$$Corr(f(\boldsymbol{x_1}), f(\boldsymbol{x_2})) = Corr_{G_0}(K(\boldsymbol{x_1}, \boldsymbol{\theta}), K(\boldsymbol{x_2}, \boldsymbol{\theta})) \times Corr(G_{\boldsymbol{x}_1}, G_{\boldsymbol{x}_2}), \tag{3.8}$$

where

$$Corr(G_{\boldsymbol{x}_1}, G_{\boldsymbol{x}_2}) = \frac{2}{\alpha+2} \sum_{k \in T(\boldsymbol{x_1}, \boldsymbol{x_2})} \left(\frac{\alpha}{\alpha+2}\right)^{\#S_k} \left(\frac{\alpha}{\alpha+1}\right)^{\#S'_k}. \tag{3.9}$$

The expression for the correlation in (3.9) has been obtained by GS.

The above results provide an expression for the correlation conditional on a fixed ordering. To obtain the unconditional correlation it is necessary to marginalize the conditional correlation over the point processs Φ. Following GS we also modify the notation as follows: we now let $T(\boldsymbol{x}_1, \boldsymbol{x}_2) = \Phi \cap U(\boldsymbol{x}_1) \cap U(\boldsymbol{x}_2)$, $A_{\ell k} = A_\ell(\boldsymbol{z}_k)$, where $A_\ell(\boldsymbol{z}) = \{\boldsymbol{w} \in \Phi \cap U(\boldsymbol{x}_\ell) : \|\boldsymbol{w} - \boldsymbol{x}_\ell\| < \|\boldsymbol{z} - \boldsymbol{x}_\ell\|\}$, for $\boldsymbol{z} \in \Phi \cap U(\boldsymbol{x}_\ell)$. As already mentioned in Section 3.1, when $\boldsymbol{x} = (\boldsymbol{s}', t)'$, we define $U(\boldsymbol{x}) = D \times (-\infty, t]$.

Also, for $\boldsymbol{z} \in T(\boldsymbol{x}_1, \boldsymbol{x}_2)$, we let $S(\boldsymbol{z}) = A_1(\boldsymbol{z}) \cap A_2(\boldsymbol{z})$ and $S'(\boldsymbol{z}) = A_1(\boldsymbol{z}) \cup A_2(\boldsymbol{z}) - S(\boldsymbol{z})$, which imply that $S(\boldsymbol{z}) = \{\boldsymbol{w} \in T(\boldsymbol{x}_1, \boldsymbol{x}_2) : \|\boldsymbol{w} - \boldsymbol{x}_1\| < \|\boldsymbol{z} - \boldsymbol{x}_1\| \text{ and } \|\boldsymbol{w} - \boldsymbol{x}_2\| < \|\boldsymbol{z} - \boldsymbol{x}_2\|\}$.

We further define, as in GS, $S_{-\boldsymbol{z}}(\boldsymbol{z})$ and $S'_{-\boldsymbol{z}}(\boldsymbol{z})$ to be translations of $S(\boldsymbol{z})$ and $S'(\boldsymbol{z})$, respectively, by $-\boldsymbol{z}$. Then, the refined Campbell theorem yields, in the case where Φ is a stationary point process with intensity λ:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Corr}(f(\boldsymbol{x}_1), f(\boldsymbol{x}_2)) &= \text{Corr}_{G_0}(K(\boldsymbol{x}_1, \boldsymbol{\theta}), K(\boldsymbol{x}_2, \boldsymbol{\theta})) \\ &\quad \times \frac{2\lambda}{\alpha+2} \int_{U(\boldsymbol{x}_1) \cap U(\boldsymbol{x}_2)} \int \left(\frac{\alpha}{\alpha+2}\right)^{\phi_{-\boldsymbol{z}}(S_{-\boldsymbol{z}})} \left(\frac{\alpha}{\alpha+1}\right)^{\phi_{-\boldsymbol{z}}(S'_{-\boldsymbol{z}})} P_0(d\phi) d\boldsymbol{z} \end{aligned} \tag{3.10}$$

In (3.10), $P_0(d\phi)$ is the Palm distribution of Φ at the origin, and $\phi_{-\boldsymbol{z}}$ is the realization of Φ translated by $-\boldsymbol{z}$. Note also that the second factor of the above correlation is the unconditional correlation between $G_{\boldsymbol{x}_1}$ and $G_{\boldsymbol{x}_2}$ (see GS). The following theorem, the proof of which is provided in Section S-3 of the supplement, shows that the above correlation structure of our kernel convolution based ODDP satisfies desirable properties.

Theorem 4 *Corr*$(f(\boldsymbol{x}_1), f(\boldsymbol{x}_2)) \to 1$ *as* $\|\boldsymbol{x}_1 - \boldsymbol{x}_2\| \to 0$ *and* *Corr*$(f(\boldsymbol{x}_1), f(\boldsymbol{x}_2)) \to 0$ *as* $\|\boldsymbol{x}_1 - \boldsymbol{x}_2\| \to \infty$.

Under a stationary Poisson process assumption for Φ, and for particular specifications of $U(\boldsymbol{x})$ mentioned in Section 3.1, the calculations of GS show that this factor depends upon $\boldsymbol{x}_1$ and $\boldsymbol{x}_2$ only through $\|\boldsymbol{x}_1 - \boldsymbol{x}_2\|$, leading to isotropy of the process. There does not seem to exist any result analogous to the refined Campbell theorem in the context of nonstationary Poisson process which might allow one to construct a nonstationary correlation structure in this case. The analytic form of the ODDP correlation structure need not be available for other constructions of $U(\boldsymbol{x})$ either. Isotropy results even in the case of the more flexible Cox processes.

On the other hand, our kernel convolution idea neatly solves this problem of attainment of nonstationarity via the first factor of our correlation structure given in (3.10). Indeed, the kernel $K(\boldsymbol{x}, \boldsymbol{\theta})$ can be chosen in the spirit of Higdon et al. (1999), for instance, such that $\text{Corr}_{G_0}(K(\boldsymbol{x}_1, \boldsymbol{\theta}), K(\boldsymbol{x}_2, \boldsymbol{\theta}))$ does not depend upon $\boldsymbol{x}_1 - \boldsymbol{x}_2$ alone. In other words, by simply controlling the kernel we can ensure nonstationarity of our process $f(\cdot)$ even if the underlying ODDP is stationary or even isotropic. Of course, our process can be made stationary as well by choosing the kernel, say, in the spirit of Higdon (1998), and setting $U(\boldsymbol{x})$ to be of the forms specified by GS, when $\boldsymbol{x}$ consists of either only spatial co-ordinates or only temporal co-ordinate. When $\boldsymbol{x} = (\boldsymbol{s}', t)'$, then we set $U(\boldsymbol{x}) = D \times (-\infty, t]$, as already mentioned before.

We further note that our general space-time correlation structure given by (3.8) is non-separable, that is, in general, $\text{Corr}(f(\boldsymbol{s}_1, t_1), f(\boldsymbol{s}_2, t_2)) \neq \text{Corr}_1(\boldsymbol{s}_1, \boldsymbol{s}_2) \times \text{Corr}_2(t_1, t_2)$, where Corr_1 and Corr_2 are spatial and temporal structures respectively. However, if desired, separability can be easily induced by allowing the kernel to depend upon only the spatial location and by allowing the ordering $\boldsymbol{\pi}$ to depend only upon time, or the vice versa. Specifically, letting $K(\boldsymbol{x}, \boldsymbol{\theta}) = K(\boldsymbol{s}, \boldsymbol{\theta})$ and $\boldsymbol{\pi}(\boldsymbol{x}) = \boldsymbol{\pi}(t)$, we obtain

$$\text{Corr}(f(\boldsymbol{s}_1, t_1), f(\boldsymbol{s}_2, t_2)) = \text{Corr}_{G_0}(K(\boldsymbol{s}_1, \boldsymbol{\theta}), K(\boldsymbol{s}_2, \boldsymbol{\theta})) \times \text{Corr}(G_{t_1}, G_{t_2}), \tag{3.11}$$

and letting $K(\boldsymbol{x}, \boldsymbol{\theta}) = K(t, \boldsymbol{\theta})$ and $\boldsymbol{\pi}(\boldsymbol{x}) = \boldsymbol{\pi}(\boldsymbol{s})$, we obtain

$$\text{Corr}(f(\boldsymbol{s}_1, t_1), f(\boldsymbol{s}_2, t_2)) = \text{Corr}_{G_0}(K(t_1, \boldsymbol{\theta}), K(t_2, \boldsymbol{\theta})) \times \text{Corr}(G_{\boldsymbol{s}_1}, G_{\boldsymbol{s}_2}), \tag{3.12}$$

In contrast, under the ODDP approach of GS, it is clear from the correlation structure that $\text{Corr}(G_{\boldsymbol{x}_1}, G_{\boldsymbol{x}_2}) \neq \text{Corr}_1(\boldsymbol{s}_1, \boldsymbol{s}_2) \times \text{Corr}_2(t_1, t_2)$, showing that separability can not be enforced if desired.

Thus, following our approach it is easy to construct nonparametric covariance structures that are either stationary or nonstationary, which, in turn, can be constructed as either separable or nonseparable, as desired. These illustrate the considerable flexibility inherent in our approach, while satisying at the same time the desirable conditions that the correlation between $f(\boldsymbol{x}_1)$ and $f(\boldsymbol{x}_2)$ tends to 1 or zero accordingly as the distance between $\boldsymbol{x}_1$ and $\boldsymbol{x}_2$ tends to zero or infinity.

In the next section we provide a brief overview of the other available approaches for nonstationary modelling of spatio-temporal data.

4. CONTINUITY AND SMOOTHNESS PROPERTIES OF OUR MODEL

For stationary models, properties like continuity and smoothness can be quite generally characterized by the continuity and smoothness of the correlation function. In particular, continuity and smoothness of stationary processes typically depend upon the behaviour of the correlation function at zero; see Yaglom (1987*a*) and Yaglom (1987*b*) for details. For nonstationary processes, however, such elegant theory is not available. Indeed, the structure of the correlation function itself may be difficult to get hold of, rendering it difficult to investigate the properties of the underlying nonstationary stochastic process. For our purpose, we utilize the notions of almost sure continuity, mean square continuity and mean square differentiability of stochastic processes (see, for example, Stein (1999), Banerjee & Gelfand (2003)) to study the properties of our nonstationary spatio-temporal process.

Definition 5 *A process* $\{X(\boldsymbol{x}), \boldsymbol{x} \in \mathbb{R}^d\}$ *is* L_2 *continuous at* $\boldsymbol{x}_0$ *if* $\lim_{\boldsymbol{x} \to \boldsymbol{x}_0} E[X(\boldsymbol{x}) - X(\boldsymbol{x}_0)]^2 = 0$. *Continuity in the* L_2 *sense is also referred to as mean square continuity and will be denoted*

by $X(\boldsymbol{x}) \xrightarrow{L_2} X(\boldsymbol{x}_0)$.

Definition 6 *A process* $\{X(\boldsymbol{x}), \boldsymbol{x} \in \mathbb{R}^d\}$ *is almost surely continuous at* $\boldsymbol{x}_0$ *if* $X(\boldsymbol{x}) \to X(\boldsymbol{x}_0)$ *a.s. as* $\boldsymbol{x} \to \boldsymbol{x_0}$. *If the process is almost surely continuous for every* $\boldsymbol{x_0} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ *then the process is said to have continuous realizations.*

Theorem 7 *Assume the following conditions:*

(A1) For all $\boldsymbol{x}$ *and* $\boldsymbol{\theta}$, $|K(\boldsymbol{x}, \boldsymbol{\theta})| < M$ *for some* $M < \infty$.

(A2) Given any $\boldsymbol{\theta}$, $K(\boldsymbol{x}, \boldsymbol{\theta})$ *is a continuous function of* $\boldsymbol{x}$.

Then $f(\cdot)$ *is both almost surely continuous and mean square continuous in the interior of* $\cap_{k=1}^{\infty} A_{ki_k}$, *where* $A_{ki_k} = \{\boldsymbol{x} : \pi_k(\boldsymbol{x}) = i_k\}$, *and for each* $k = 1, 2, \ldots$, $i_k \in \{1, 2, \ldots\}$; $i_k \neq i_{k'}$ *for any* $k \neq k'$. *On the other hand,* $f(\cdot)$ *is almost surely discontinuous at any point* $\boldsymbol{x}_0 \in \cap_{k=1}^{\infty} A_{ki_k}$ *lying on the boundary of* A_{ki_k}, *for any* i_k.

See Section S-4 for a proof of this result. Now we examine mean square differentiability of our process.

Definition 8 *A process* $\{X(\boldsymbol{x}), \boldsymbol{x} \in \mathbb{R}^d\}$ *is said to be mean square differentiable at* $\boldsymbol{x}_0$ *if for any direction* $\boldsymbol{u}$, *there exists a process* $L_{\boldsymbol{x}_0}(\boldsymbol{u})$, *linear in* $\boldsymbol{u}$ *such that*

$$X(\boldsymbol{x}_0 + \boldsymbol{u}) = X(\boldsymbol{x}_0) + L_{\boldsymbol{x}_0}(\boldsymbol{u}) + R(\boldsymbol{x}_0, \boldsymbol{u}), \text{ where } \frac{R(\boldsymbol{x}_0, \boldsymbol{u})}{\|\boldsymbol{u}\|} \xrightarrow{L_2} 0.$$

Theorem 9 *Assume the following conditions:*

(B1) For all $\boldsymbol{x}$ *and* $\boldsymbol{\theta}$, $|K(\boldsymbol{x}, \boldsymbol{\theta})| < M$ *for some* $M < \infty$.

(B2) Given any $\boldsymbol{\theta}$, $K(\boldsymbol{x}, \boldsymbol{\theta})$ *is a continuously differentiable function of* $\boldsymbol{x}$.

Then $f(\cdot)$ *is mean square differentiable in the interior of* $\cap_{k=1}^{\infty} A_{ki_k}$.

See Section S-5 for a proof of this theorem.

5. TRUNCATION OF THE INFINITE SUMMAND

Since our proposed model $f(\boldsymbol{x}) = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} K(\boldsymbol{x}, \boldsymbol{\theta}_{\pi(\boldsymbol{x})}) p_i(\boldsymbol{x})$ is an infinite (random) series, for model-fitting purpose it is necessary to truncate the series to $f(\boldsymbol{x}) = \sum_{k=1}^{N} K(\boldsymbol{x}, \boldsymbol{\theta}_{\pi(\boldsymbol{x})}) p_i(\boldsymbol{x})$, where N is to be determined, or to implement variable-dimensional Markov chain methods where N is to considered a random variable so that the number of parameters associated with $f(\boldsymbol{x})$ is also a random variable.

Although we will describe and implement a novel variable dimensional Markov chain methodology introduced by Das & Bhattacharya (2014*b*), which the authors refer to as Transdimensional Transformation based Markov Chain Monte Carlo (TTMCMC), we first prove a theorem with respect to truncation of the infinite random series. Note that in the context of traditional Dirichlet process characterized by Sethuraman's stick breaking construction (Sethuraman (1994)) which involves infinite random series, Ishwaran & James (2001) proposed a method of truncating the infinite series.

We now state our theorem on truncation, the proof of which is provided in Section S-6 of the supplement. But before stating the theorem it is necessary to define some required notation. Let

$$P_N(\boldsymbol{x}_i) = \sum_{i=1}^{N} K(\boldsymbol{x}_i, \theta_i) p_i, \quad \text{and} \quad P(\boldsymbol{x}_i) = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} K(\boldsymbol{x}_i, \theta_i) p_i,$$

where N needs to be determined. Also let

$$P_N = (P_N(\boldsymbol{x}_1), \ldots, P_N(\boldsymbol{x}_n))' \quad \text{and} \quad P = (P(\boldsymbol{x}_1), \ldots, P(\boldsymbol{x}_n))',$$

and denote by Θ_N and Θ the sets of random quantities $(V_i, \boldsymbol{\theta}_i)$ associated with P_N and P respectively. We define the following marginal densities of the vector of observations $\boldsymbol{y} = \{y_1, \ldots, y_n\}$:

$$\begin{aligned} m_N(\boldsymbol{y}) &= \int_{\Theta_N} [\boldsymbol{y}|P_N][P_N] d\Theta_N \\ &= \int_{\Theta} [\boldsymbol{y}|P_N][P] d\Theta, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$m_\infty(\boldsymbol{y}) = \int_\Theta [\boldsymbol{y}|P][P]d\Theta.$$

Theorem 10 *Under the assumption that* $\sup_{\boldsymbol{\theta}} K(x_i, \boldsymbol{\theta}) \leq M$ *for* $i = 1, \ldots, n$, *where* $M > 0$ *is a finite constant, we have*

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} |m_N(\boldsymbol{y}) - m_\infty(\boldsymbol{y})|\, d\boldsymbol{y} \leq 4M^2 n \left(\frac{\alpha}{\alpha+2}\right)^N + 2\sqrt{\frac{2}{\pi}} Mn \left(\frac{\alpha}{\alpha+1}\right)^N.$$

6. CHOICE OF KERNEL, PRIOR DISTRIBUTIONS AND COMPUTATIONAL REGION

The choice of kernel $K(\cdot,\cdot)$ plays a crucial role in nonstationary spatio-temporal data analysis. For instance, if $K(\boldsymbol{x}, \boldsymbol{\theta}) = K(\boldsymbol{x} - \boldsymbol{\theta})$, then the correlation between $Y(\boldsymbol{x}_1)$ and $Y(\boldsymbol{x}_2)$ turns out to be a function of $\boldsymbol{x}_1 - \boldsymbol{x}_2$, thus inducing stationarity. For the purpose of nonstationarity, it is necessary to make the parameters of the kernel depend upon space and time. In the spatial context such nonstationary kernels are considered in Higdon et al. (1999). In this paper, we consider a nonstationary space-time kernel; for the spatial part of the kernel we essentially adopt the dependence structure proposed by Higdon et al. (1999) and for the temporal part we allow the relevant coefficient to be time varying, modeled by a stationary Gaussian process.

In particular, we consider the following kernel for our applications:

$$K(\boldsymbol{s}, t, \boldsymbol{\theta}, \tau) = \exp\left\{-\frac{1}{2}(\boldsymbol{s} - \boldsymbol{\theta})^T \Sigma(\boldsymbol{s})(\boldsymbol{s} - \boldsymbol{\theta}) - \delta(t)|t - \tau|\right\},$$

where $\Sigma(\boldsymbol{s})$ is a 2×2 positive definite dispersion matrix depending upon $\boldsymbol{s}$, and $\delta(t) > 0$ depends upon time t. We assume that $\log(\delta(t))$ is a zero mean Gaussian process with covariance $c_\delta(t_1, t_2) = \sigma_\delta^2 \exp\{(t_1 - t_2)^2/a_\delta\}$. Following Higdon et al. (1999) we set

$$\Sigma(\boldsymbol{s})^{\frac{1}{2}} = \varphi \begin{pmatrix} \left[\frac{\sqrt{4A^2 + \|\psi(\boldsymbol{s})\|^4\pi^2}}{2\pi} + \frac{\|\psi(\boldsymbol{s})\|^2}{2}\right]^{\frac{1}{2}} & 0 \\ 0 & \left[\frac{\sqrt{4A^2 + \|\psi(\boldsymbol{s})\|^4\pi^2}}{2\pi} - \frac{\|\psi(\boldsymbol{s})\|^2}{2}\right]^{\frac{1}{2}} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \cos\ \alpha(\boldsymbol{s}) & \sin\ \alpha(\boldsymbol{s}) \\ -\sin\ \alpha(\boldsymbol{s}) & \cos\ \alpha(\boldsymbol{s}) \end{pmatrix},$$

where $\|\psi(\boldsymbol{s})\|^2 = \psi_1^2(\boldsymbol{s}) + \psi_2^2(\boldsymbol{s})$ and $\alpha(\boldsymbol{s}) = \tan^{-1}\left(\frac{\psi_2(\boldsymbol{s})}{\psi_1(\boldsymbol{s})}\right)$. We assume, following Higdon et al. (1999), that $\psi_1(\cdot)$ and $\psi_2(\cdot)$ are independent and identical zero mean Gaussian processes with covariance $c_\psi(\boldsymbol{s}_1, \boldsymbol{s}_2) = \sigma_\psi^2 \exp\{-\|\boldsymbol{s}_1 - \boldsymbol{s}_2\|^2/b_\psi\}$. Following Higdon et al. (1999) we put $U(3, 200)$ prior on φ, a_δ, and b_ψ; we set $\sigma_\delta^2 = \sigma_\psi^2 = 1$. As proposed by Higdon et al. (1999), we set $A = 3.5$. Since in our applications we center and scale the observed time points, for τ we specify the $N(0, 1)$ prior.

6.1 Elicitation of hyperparameters of the underlying ODDP

6.1.1. Choice of G_0 In our applications, we center and scale each of the two components $\{s_{1i};\ i = 1, \ldots, n\}$ and $\{s_{2i};\ i = 1, \ldots, n\}$ of the available spatial locations $\{\boldsymbol{s}_i = (s_{1i}, s_{2i});\ i = 1, \ldots, n\}$. Consequently, the choosing G_0 to be the bivariate normal distribution with both means zero, both variances equal to one, and correlation ρ appears to be reasonable. We estimate ρ by the empirical correlation between $\{s_{1i};\ i = 1, \ldots, n\}$ and $\{s_{2i};\ i = 1, \ldots, n\}$.

6.1.2. Prior selection for α For the choice of prior distributions of the parameters associated with the ODDP we follow Griffin & Steel (2004) and GS. In particular, we put the inverted Beta distribution prior on α, given by

$$p(\alpha) = \frac{{n_0}^\eta \Gamma(2\eta)\alpha^{\eta-1}}{\Gamma(\eta)^2(\alpha + n_0)^{2\eta}},$$

where the hyperparameter n_0 is the prior median of α. Note that the prior variance exists if $\eta > 2$ and is a decreasing function of η. This prior implies that $\frac{\alpha}{\alpha+n_0}$ follows a $Beta(\eta, \eta)$ distribution.

6.1.3. Prior selection for λ Note that, for small α, only the first few elements of stick breaking representation are important, so fewer number of points from the underlying Poisson process is needed to induce the second factor of the correlation structure (3.10) which roughly depends upon the ratio $\lambda/(\alpha + 1)$ for $U(\boldsymbol{x}) = D$ (spatial problem) and $U(x) = (-\infty, x]$ (temporal problem); see GS for the details. Thus a relatively small value of λ suffices in

such cases. Similarly, when α is larger, larger λ is necessary to obtain the same correlation. Keeping these in mind, we select the log-normal prior for λ with mean $\log(\alpha)$ and variance b_λ, say. For our applications, we choose $b_\lambda = 20$, so that we obtain a reasonably vague prior.

6.2 Computational region

Following GS, we consider a truncated region for the point process Z which includes the range of the observed $\boldsymbol{x}$. This truncated region has been referred to as the computational region by GS. In particular, we choose a bounding box of the form $(a_1, b_1) \times (a_2, b_2) \times \cdots \times (a_d, b_d)$ as the computational region, where $a_i = d_{a_i} - r$, $b_i = d_{b_i} - r$. Here d_{a_i} and d_{b_i} are the minimum and the maximum of $\boldsymbol{x}$ in dimension i, and $r = 2\left(\frac{\Gamma(d/2)d}{2\pi^{d/2}}\frac{\alpha+1}{\lambda}\log\frac{1}{\epsilon}\right)^{\frac{1}{d}}$, with $\epsilon = \exp\left\{-\frac{\lambda}{\alpha+1}\frac{2\pi^{d/2}}{\Gamma(d/2)d}\left(\frac{r}{2}\right)^d\right\}$. See GS for justification of these choices.

7. JOINT POSTERIOR AND A BRIEFING OF TTMCMC FOR UPDATING PARAMETERS IN OUR VARIABLE DIMENSIONAL MODELING FRAMEWORK

Let k denote the random number of summands in

$$f_k(\boldsymbol{x}) = \sum_{i=1}^{k} K(\boldsymbol{x}, \boldsymbol{\theta}_{\pi_i(\boldsymbol{x})}) p_i(\boldsymbol{x}) \ \forall \boldsymbol{x} \in D \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d. \tag{7.1}$$

Let $\boldsymbol{V} = (V_1, \ldots, V_k)$, $\boldsymbol{z} = (z_1, \ldots, z_k)$, $\boldsymbol{\theta} = (\boldsymbol{\theta}_1, \boldsymbol{\theta}_2)$, with $\boldsymbol{\theta}_1 = (\theta_{11}, \ldots, \theta_{1k})$ and $\boldsymbol{\theta}_1 = (\theta_{21}, \ldots, \theta_{2k})$. Let also $\boldsymbol{\psi}_1 = (\psi_1(\boldsymbol{s}_1), \ldots, \psi_1(\boldsymbol{s}_n))$, $\boldsymbol{\psi}_2 = (\psi_2(\boldsymbol{s}_1), \ldots, \psi_2(\boldsymbol{s}_n))$ and $\boldsymbol{\delta} = (\delta(t_1), \ldots, \delta(t_n))$. The joint posterior is of the form

$$\begin{aligned}
&\pi(k, \boldsymbol{V}, \boldsymbol{z}, \boldsymbol{\theta}_1, \boldsymbol{\theta}_2, \boldsymbol{\psi}_1, \boldsymbol{\psi}_2, \boldsymbol{\delta}, \tau, \sigma, \alpha, \lambda, b_\psi, a_\delta | \boldsymbol{Y}) \\
&\propto \pi(k)\pi(\boldsymbol{V}, \boldsymbol{z}, \boldsymbol{\theta}_1, \boldsymbol{\theta}_2 | k)\pi(\boldsymbol{\psi}_1, \boldsymbol{\psi}_2, \boldsymbol{\delta})\pi(\tau, \varphi, b_\psi, a_\delta)\pi(\sigma)\pi(\alpha)\pi(\lambda|\alpha) \times L(\boldsymbol{V}, \boldsymbol{z}, \boldsymbol{\theta}_1, \boldsymbol{\theta}_2, \sigma | k, \boldsymbol{Y}),
\end{aligned} \tag{7.2}$$

where $L(\boldsymbol{V}, \boldsymbol{z}, \boldsymbol{\theta}_1, \boldsymbol{\theta}_2, \sigma | k, \boldsymbol{Y})$ is the joint normal likelihood of $\boldsymbol{V}, \boldsymbol{z}, \boldsymbol{\theta}_1, \boldsymbol{\theta}_2, \sigma$ under the model

$$y_i = f_k(\boldsymbol{x}_i) + \epsilon_i; \ \epsilon_i \overset{iid}{\sim} N(0, \sigma^2); \ i = 1, \ldots, n, \tag{7.3}$$

conditional on $f_k(\cdot)$.

For our applications, as the prior $\pi(k)$ on k we assume the discrete uniform prior on $\{1, 2, \ldots, 30\}$; in our applications k never even reached 30. Under $\pi(\boldsymbol{V}, \boldsymbol{z}, \boldsymbol{\theta}_1, \boldsymbol{\theta}_2|k)$, $V_i \overset{iid}{\sim} Beta(1, \alpha)$; $i = 1, \ldots, k$, $\boldsymbol{z}$ are realizations from the Poisson process with intensity λ, and for $i = 1, \ldots, k$, $(\theta_{1i}, \theta_{2i}) \overset{iid}{\sim} G_0$. Under $\pi(\boldsymbol{\psi}_1, \boldsymbol{\psi}_2, \boldsymbol{\delta})$, ψ_1, ψ_2, δ are independent Gaussian processes, as detailed in Section 6. The prior distribution of $\tau, \varphi, b_\psi, a_\delta$, denoted by $\pi(\tau, \varphi, b_\psi, a_\delta)$, is already provided in Section 6. For the error standard deviation σ, the prior denoted by $\pi(\sigma)$ is the log-normal distribution with parameters 0 and 1, so that the mean and variance of σ are about 1.6 and 5, respectively. These quantities appear to be reasonable, and yielded adequate inference.

In order to obtain samples from the joint posterior (7.2) which involve the variable dimensional $f_k(\cdot)$, we implement the TTMCMC methodology. In a nutshell, TTMCMC updates all the parameters, both fixed and variable dimensional, as well as the number of parameters of the underlying posterior distribution in a single block using simple deterministic transformations of some low-dimensional random variable drawn from some fixed, but low-dimensional arbitrary distribution defined on some relevant support. The idea is an extension of Transformation based Markov Chain Monte Carlo (TMCMC) introduced by Dutta & Bhattacharya (2014) for updating high-dimensional parameters with known dimensionality in a single block using simple deterministic transformations of some low-dimensional (usually one-dimensional) random variable having arbitrary distribution on some relevant support. The strategy of updating high and variable dimensional parameters using very low-dimensional random variables clearly reduces dimensionality dramatically, thus greatly improving acceptance rate, mixing properties, and computational speed. In Section S-7 of the supplement we provide a detailed overview of TTMCMC, propose a general algorithm (Algorithm S-7.1) with certain advantages, and in Section S-8 of the supplement we specialize the algorithm to our spatio-temporal modeling set-up, providing full updating details (Algorithm S-8.1).

8. SIMULATION STUDY

To illustrate the performance of our model we first create a synthetic data generating process which is nonstationary and non-Gaussian. One popular method to create such process is the kernel convolution approach. However, since we have developed our spatio-temporal model itself using the kernel convolution approach, it is perhaps desirable to obtain the synthetic data from some nonstationary, non-Gaussian process created using some approach independent of the kernel convolution method. In Section 8.1 we detail such an approach. Then we fit our proposed model to the data pretending that the data-generating process is unknown.

8.1 A nonstationary non-Gaussian data generating process

Let $X(\cdot)$ denote a stationary Gaussian process with mean function $\mu(t, \boldsymbol{s}) = \beta_0 + \beta_1 t + \beta_2 s(1) + \beta_3 s(2)$, with $\boldsymbol{s} = (s(1), s(2))$, and covariance function

$$A(i,j) = c((t_i, \boldsymbol{s}_i), (t_j, \boldsymbol{s}_j)) = \exp\left\{-0.5\left(\sqrt{(t_i - t_j)^2 + (s_{1i} - s_{1j})^2 + (s_{2i} - s_{2j})^2}\right)\right\},$$

for any $t_i, t_j, \boldsymbol{s}_i = (s_{1i}, s_{2i}), \boldsymbol{s}_j = (s_{1j}, s_{2j})$.

Let $\boldsymbol{X} = (X(t_1, \boldsymbol{s}_1), \ldots, X(t_n, \boldsymbol{s}_n))'$ denote observed data points from the Gaussian process X at the design points $\{(t_i, \boldsymbol{s}_i);\ i = 1, \ldots, n\}$. Let $\boldsymbol{t} = (t_1, \ldots, t_n)'$ and $\boldsymbol{S} = (\boldsymbol{s}_1', \ldots, \boldsymbol{s}_n')'$. Further, let us denote by $\boldsymbol{A} = (A(i,j); i = 1, \ldots, n;\ j = 1, \ldots, n)$ the covariance matrix and $\boldsymbol{\mu} = (\mu(t_1, \boldsymbol{s}_1), \ldots, \mu(t_n, \boldsymbol{s}_n))'$. Then the posterior process $[X(\cdot)|\boldsymbol{X}]$ is non-stationary Gaussian with mean function $\mu_X(t, \boldsymbol{s}) = \mu(t, \boldsymbol{s}) + \boldsymbol{A}_{12}\boldsymbol{A}_{22}^{-1}(\boldsymbol{X} - \boldsymbol{\mu})$ and variance $\boldsymbol{A}_{11} - \boldsymbol{A}_{12}\boldsymbol{A}_{22}^{-1}\boldsymbol{A}_{21}$, where $\boldsymbol{A} = \begin{pmatrix} \boldsymbol{A}_{11} & \boldsymbol{A}_{12} \\ \boldsymbol{A}_{21} & \boldsymbol{A}_{22} \end{pmatrix}$.

Let the posterior nonstationary Gaussian process $[X(\cdot)|\boldsymbol{X}]$ be denoted by $X^*(\cdot)$. Now consider another process $Y(\cdot)$ with mean function $\mu^*(t, \boldsymbol{s}) = X^*(t, \boldsymbol{s})$ and covariance function $c_Y((t_i, \boldsymbol{s}_i), (t_j, \boldsymbol{s}_j)) = \exp\{-0.5\,|X^*(t_i, \boldsymbol{s}_i) - X^*(t_j, \boldsymbol{s}_j)|\}$. Then marginally, $Y(\cdot)$ is a nonstationary non-Gaussian process.

For our illustration we will simulate the synthetic dataset from the process $Y(\cdot)$. The algorithm for generation of this synthetic data is provided next.

8.2 Algorithm for generating the synthetic data

We have perfomed the following steps to simulate a non stationary 95×1 vector:

1. We first take a grid of size 100.

2. We generate one random number t_i from each interval $(i-1, i]$; $i = 1, \ldots, 100$ as 100 time points. We store the time points in a vector which we denote by $\boldsymbol{t} = (t(1), \ldots, t(100))'$.

3. Next we generate 100 random points of the form $\{\boldsymbol{s}_i = (s(1,i), s(2,i));\ i = 1, \ldots, 100\}$ from $[0, 50] \times [0, 50]$ as locations. We store the locations in a 100×2 matrix $\boldsymbol{S} = (\boldsymbol{s}_1', \ldots, \boldsymbol{s}_{100}')'$.

4. Then we randomly choose 5 time points from $\boldsymbol{t}$ and 5 locations from $\boldsymbol{S}$ and omit these random points from $\boldsymbol{t}$ and $\boldsymbol{S}$. So, we obtain a new time vector of length 95, say $\boldsymbol{t}_{95}$ and a new matrix of locations of order 95×2, say $\boldsymbol{S}_{95}$. We store the omitted time points in a separate vector, $\boldsymbol{t}_5$, and the locations in a separate matrix, $\boldsymbol{S}_5$, for future use.

5. Next we calculate the covariance matrix $\boldsymbol{A} = (\boldsymbol{A}(i,j))$ of order 100×100 based on $\boldsymbol{t}$ and $\boldsymbol{S}$, where (i,j)-th element of $\boldsymbol{A}$ is given by

$$\boldsymbol{A}(i,j) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } i = j \\ \exp\left(-0.5\sqrt{(t(i)-t(j))^2 + (s(1,i)-s(1,j))^2 + (s(2,i)-s(2,j))^2}\right) & \text{if } i \neq j \end{cases}$$

6. We partition the above covariance function $\boldsymbol{A}$ consisting of four component matrices $\boldsymbol{A}_{11}, \boldsymbol{A}_{12}, \boldsymbol{A}_{21}$ and $\boldsymbol{A}_{22}$, where $\boldsymbol{A}_{11}$ is a 5×5 covariance matrix based on $\boldsymbol{t}_5$ and $\boldsymbol{S}_5$; $\boldsymbol{A}_{22}$ is a 95×95 covariance matrix based on $\boldsymbol{t}_{95}$ and $\boldsymbol{S}_{95}$ (the form of the (i,j)-th element being the same as for the matrix $\boldsymbol{A}$, except now $\boldsymbol{t}$, $\boldsymbol{S}$ are replaced with $\boldsymbol{t}_5$ and $\boldsymbol{S}_5$ for $\boldsymbol{A}_{11}$; for $\boldsymbol{A}_{22}$, $\boldsymbol{t}$, $\boldsymbol{S}$ are replaced with $\boldsymbol{t}_{95}$ and $\boldsymbol{S}_{95}$); $\boldsymbol{A}_{12} = \boldsymbol{A}_{21}^T$ is a 5×95 matrix, containing the covariances between the deleted points and existing points. The (i,j)-th element of $\boldsymbol{A}_{12}$ is given by

$$\boldsymbol{A}_{12}(i,j) = \left(-0.5\sqrt{(t_5(i)-t_{95}(j))^2 + (s_5(1,i)-s_{95}(1,j))^2 + (s_5(2,i)-s_{95}(2,j))^2}\right),$$

for $i = 1, \ldots 5$ and $j = 1, \ldots, 95$.

7. Next we generate one 5 dimensional random sample, $\boldsymbol{x}_5$, from a 5 variate normal distribution with mean function

$$\boldsymbol{\mu}_5^T = \boldsymbol{D}_5\boldsymbol{\beta},$$

and covariance matrix $\boldsymbol{A}_{11}$, where $\boldsymbol{\beta}_5^T = (0.1, 0.01, 0.02)$ and $\boldsymbol{D}_5 = (\boldsymbol{t}_5 \vdots \boldsymbol{S}_5)$ is the design matrix. Note that $\boldsymbol{D}_5$ is a 5×3 matrix.

8. Given $\boldsymbol{x}_5$ we simulate a 95×1 random vector, $\boldsymbol{x}_{(95|5)}$ from a conditional 95 variate normal distribution with mean

$$\boldsymbol{\mu}_{(95|5)}^T = \boldsymbol{D}_{95}\boldsymbol{\beta} + (\boldsymbol{x}_5 - \boldsymbol{\mu}_5)^T \boldsymbol{A}_{11}^{-1}\boldsymbol{A}_{12}$$

and covariance

$$\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{(95|5)} = \boldsymbol{A}_{22} - \boldsymbol{A}_{21}\boldsymbol{A}_{11}^{-1}\boldsymbol{A}_{12},$$

where $\boldsymbol{D}_{95}$ is obtained exactly same as $\boldsymbol{D}_5$, only $\boldsymbol{t}_5$ and $\boldsymbol{S}_5$ are replaced with $\boldsymbol{t}_{95}$ and $\boldsymbol{S}_{95}$, respectively.

9. The last step is to simulate a 95×1 vector, $\boldsymbol{y}_{(95|\boldsymbol{x}_{(95|5)})}$, conditionally on $\boldsymbol{x}_{(95|5)}$. We simulate $\boldsymbol{y}_{(95|\boldsymbol{x}_{(95|5)})}$ from a 95 variate normal distribution with mean

$$\boldsymbol{\mu}_{\boldsymbol{y}}^T = 0.01(\boldsymbol{x}_{(95|5)})^T$$

and covariance matrix

$$\Sigma_{\boldsymbol{y}} = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } i = j \\ \exp\left(-0.5\left(|x_{(95|5)}(i) - x_{(95|5)}(j)|\right)\right) & \text{if } i \neq j, \end{cases}$$

for $i = 1, \ldots 95$ and $j = 1, \ldots 95$.

8.3 Results of fitting our model to the simulated data

Note that for this problem the number of parameters to be updated ranges between 300 to 400. Our TTMCMC based model implementation took 35 mins to yield 900000 realizations following a burn-in of 100000. Quite encouragingly, TTMCMC exhibited satisfactory acceptance rate and mixing properties.

8.3.1. Leave-one-out cross-validation We asess the predictive power of our model with the leave-one-out cross validation method. All the 95 cases were included in the 95% highest posterior densities of the corresponding leave-one-out posterior predictive densities. Figure 10.1 displays the posterior predictive densities of six randomly selected locations, along with the true values, the latter denoted by the vertical lines. Thus, satisfactory performance of our proposed model is indicated by the results, particularly given the fact that our model does not assume knowledge of the true, data-generating, parametric model.

8.3.2. Correlation Analysis Though our simulation mechanism is completely different from our proposed model, the simulated data do exhibit the pattern that the correlations are close to zero for two widely separated locations. Indeed, from the structure of the covariance matrix $\mathbf{\Sigma}_{(95|5)}$, it is easily seen that the (i, j)-th element $(i \neq j)$ of $\mathbf{\Sigma}_{(95|5)}$ is close to zero whenever the distance between $t(i)$ and $t(j)$ and/or $\boldsymbol{s}_i$ and $\boldsymbol{s}_j$ is large.

We calculate the posterior densities of correlation for different set of locations. In formation of the pair, we select nearby locations, as well as locations which are widely separated, such that we obtain both high and low correlation values under the true, data-generating model. It is evident from Figure 10.2 that the true correlations, ranging from small to high values, lie well within their respective 95% credible intervals, vindicating reasonable performance of our model in terms of capturing the true correlation structure.

It is worth mentioning that we repeated the simulation study with 1000 simulated data points. In this case the dimension of our spatio-temporal model varies randomly between 3000 to 3100. Even in this challenging high-dimensional scenario our TTMCMC based model

implementation exhibited excellent performance. We omit details for the sake of brevity.

9. REAL DATA ANALYSIS

According to the Clean Air Act certain air quality is to be maintained to protect the public health, and to maintain proper survival environment of animals and vegetations. As a measure of the quality of air, the Clean Air Act set standard limits for important air pollutants such as ozone. For our real data analysis we use the ozone metric called W126 metric, which is the annual maximum consecutive three month running total of weighted sum of hourly concentrations observed between 8AM and 8PM on each day during the high ozone season of April through October. Also, we have information on Community Multiscale Air Quality indices(CMAQ), which is highly correlated with ozone level, so that we use these CMAQ values as a covariate in our model.

9.1 Calculating the W126 metric

Let $Q_l(\boldsymbol{s}, t)$ denote the observed ozone concentration level in parts per million (ppm) units at location $\boldsymbol{s}$ at hour l on day t, for $t = 1 \dots T$ and $l = 1 \dots 12$, where $T = 214$ days between April 1 and October 31 in a given year. The hours are the 12 day light hours between 8AM and 7PM. The W126 metric for site $\boldsymbol{s}$ is calculated as follows.

The weighted hourly metric is calculated using the transformation:

$$U_l(\boldsymbol{s}, t) = Q_l(\boldsymbol{s}, t) \times \left(\frac{1}{1 + 4403 \times \exp(-126 \times Q_l(\boldsymbol{s}, t))} \right).$$

This logistic transformation truncates the values smaller than 0.05ppm to zero, but does not alter the magnitude of values larger than 0.10ppm.

The daily index from the 12-hourly weighted values in each day is obtained as

$$Z(\boldsymbol{s}, t) = \sum_{l=1}^{12} U_l(\boldsymbol{s}, t).$$

The monthly index is calculated from the daily indices by summing and then adjusting

for the number of days in the month as follows:

$$M_j(\boldsymbol{s}) = \sum_{t \in \text{month} j} Z(\boldsymbol{s}, t), j = 1, \ldots, 7,$$

where the the summation is over all the days l that fall within the calender month j.

The three-month running totals are centered at the last month and are obtained as:

$$\bar{M}_j(\boldsymbol{s}) = \sum_{k=j-2}^{j} M_k(s), j = 3, \ldots, 7.$$

Finally, the annual W126 index value is calculated by:

$$Y(\boldsymbol{s}) = \max_{j=3}^{7} \bar{M}_j(\boldsymbol{s}).$$

The secondary ozone standard is met at a site $\boldsymbol{s}$ at a given year when the true value of $Y(\boldsymbol{s})$ is less than 21 ppm-hours.

Corresponding to each observed ozone concentration $Q_l(\boldsymbol{s}, t)$ we have a CMAQ model output $v_l(A, t)$ where the site $\boldsymbol{s}$ is contained in the unique grid cell A. Using the output $v_l(A, t)$ and the above details daily and annual indexes of CMAQ values namely $X(A, t)$ and $X(A)$ are constructed.

We have the data on annual indexes of ozone values ($W126$) $Y(\boldsymbol{s})$, and corresponding CMAQ $X(A)$ values for 76 locations in the US. Now we fit our model to this real data set. Here we model the data on the log scale; we also use the log transformation of the CMAQ values. In other words, we consider

$$\log(Y(\boldsymbol{s})) = \alpha_0 + \alpha_1 \log(X(A_i)) + f(\boldsymbol{s}_i) + \epsilon_i, \ i = 1, \ldots 76,$$

where α_0 and α_1 are regression coefficients, $f(\boldsymbol{s}_i)$ is an annual level spatial random effect at location $\boldsymbol{s}_i$ and ϵ_i is an independent nugget effect with variance σ^2. Here $f(\boldsymbol{s}_i)$ is our proposed spatial model based on kernel convolution with ODPP. All the prior distributions are the same as mentioned before. For the additional parameters α_0 and α_1, we use the vague prior distribution $N(0, 10^4)$, and for σ we use the log-normal prior with mean zero and variance 10^4.

As before, we assess the predictive power of the model unsing leave-one-out cross validation. For all the locations, the true value of ozone concentration lies within the 95% credible interval of the respective cross-validation posterior. This is summarized in the top panel of Figure 10.3, where the middle surface represents the observed data; the lower and the upper surfaces represent the lower and the upper 95% credible regions associated with the respective leave-one-out posterior predictive densities. The surface in the middle of the bottom panel are the posterior medians, while the lower and the upper surfaces denote the 95% credible intervals as before. For the convenience of visually comparing the observed data and the posterior medians, we include Figure 10.4, which also contains the 95% credible intervals. The plots clearly show that our proposed model is quite adequate for the ozone data.

Posterior densities of correlations, for 6 pairs of sites, are shown in Figure 10.5. All of them seem to give high posterior probability to the approximate range $(0.1, 0.3)$.

10. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

In this article, we have developed a non stationary, non-Gaussian spatio-temporal model based on kernel convolution of ODDP. Dependence is induced in the weights through similarities in the ordering of the atoms. Using this property we could ensure that our model-based correlation between two random data points which are widely separated, will close to zero. We incorporated non-stationarity via appropriate kernels, which would be convolved with ODDP. Although our proposed model is non stationary and non-separable, it includes stationarity and separability as special cases. Moreover, since our model is based on kernel convolution, replication is not necessary for inference. If one wishes to achieve different degrees of smoothness across space and across time, then that is also allowed by our model framework. For example, if we associate the ODDP prior only to the spatial locations, then the process will become smoother across time than across space depending on the choice of the kernel.

From the computational point of view, we have developed a fast and efficient TTMCMC

based algorithm for implementing our variable dimensional spatio-temporal model. Indeed, our model consists of a large number of variables, where the number of variables associated with the summands is random. Using TTMCMC, we could update all the parameters, as well as number of the parameters simultaneously, using simple deterministic transformations of some a one-dimensional random variable.

We illustrated the performance of our model with a simulation study and a real data example. In both cases our model exhibited excellent performance.

Although for the current paper we restricted ourselves to spatio-temporal applications only, our model is readily applicable in the functional data context. In fact, in the context of nonparametric function estimation, a new class of prior distributions can be introduced through our proposed model. Note that unknown functions can be modeled as a limit of a weighted sum of a kernels or generator functions indexed by continuous parameters. In our model the weights will be the p_i's of ODDP, and kernels are indexed by θ_i, where for $i = 1, 2, \ldots, \theta_i \overset{iid}{\sim} G_0$. We have already obtained some sufficient conditions ensuring that our model converges in L_p norm, Besov semi-norm. These results make our proposed model a promising candidate for function estimation.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We are grateful to Prof. Sujit Sahu for kindly providing us with the ozone data set and to Mr. Suman Guha for helpful dicsussions.

Supplementary Material

S-1. PROOF OF THEOREM 1

Note that

$$\int |K(\boldsymbol{x},\boldsymbol{\theta})| dG_{\boldsymbol{x}}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} |K(\boldsymbol{x},\boldsymbol{\theta}_{\pi_i(\boldsymbol{x})})| p_i, \tag{S-1.1}$$

so that the monotone convergence theorem yields

$$\begin{aligned} E\left(\int |K(\boldsymbol{x},\boldsymbol{\theta})| dG_{\boldsymbol{x}}(\boldsymbol{\theta})\right) &= \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} E\left(|K(\boldsymbol{x},\boldsymbol{\theta}_{\pi_i(\boldsymbol{x})})|\right) E(p_i) \\ &= \int |K(\boldsymbol{x},\boldsymbol{\theta})| dG_0(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} E\left(p_i\right) \\ &= \int |K(\boldsymbol{x},\boldsymbol{\theta})| dG_0(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \quad [\text{since } \textstyle\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} p_i = 1]. \end{aligned}$$

Here we have used the fact that $\boldsymbol{\theta}_i$ and V_i 's are independent. Therefore $\int |K(\boldsymbol{x},\boldsymbol{\theta})| dG_{\boldsymbol{x}}(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ is finite with probability one and hence

$$f(\boldsymbol{x}) = \int K(\boldsymbol{x},\boldsymbol{\theta}) dG_x(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} K(\boldsymbol{x},\boldsymbol{\theta}_{\pi_i(\boldsymbol{x})}) p_i(\boldsymbol{x})$$

is absolutely convergent with probability one. Since this series is bounded by (S-1.1), which is integrable, the bounded convergence theorem implies

$$\begin{aligned} E(f(\boldsymbol{x})) &= \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} E\left(K(\boldsymbol{x},\boldsymbol{\theta}_{\pi_i(\boldsymbol{x})})\right) E(p_i) \\ &= \int K(\boldsymbol{x},\boldsymbol{\theta}) dG_0(\boldsymbol{\theta}). \end{aligned}$$

■

S-2. PROOF OF THEOREM 2

$$\begin{aligned} f(\boldsymbol{x_1}) f(\boldsymbol{x_2}) &= \int K(\boldsymbol{x_1},\boldsymbol{\theta}) dG_{\boldsymbol{x_1}}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \int K(\boldsymbol{x_2},\boldsymbol{\theta}) dG_{\boldsymbol{x_2}}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \\ &= \sum_i K(\boldsymbol{x_1},\boldsymbol{\theta}_{\pi_i(\boldsymbol{x_1})}) p_i(\boldsymbol{x_1}) \sum_j K(\boldsymbol{x_2},\boldsymbol{\theta}_{\pi_j(\boldsymbol{x_2})}) p_j(\boldsymbol{x_2}) \\ &= \sum_i \sum_j K(\boldsymbol{x_1},\boldsymbol{\theta}_{\pi_i(\boldsymbol{x_1})}) K(\boldsymbol{x_2},\boldsymbol{\theta}_{\pi_j(\boldsymbol{x_2})}) p_i(\boldsymbol{x_1}) p_j(\boldsymbol{x_2}) \end{aligned} \tag{S-2.1}$$

since both the series are absolutely convergent with probability one. This is bounded in absolute value by

$$\sum_i \sum_j |K(\boldsymbol{x_1}, \boldsymbol{\theta}_{\pi_i(\boldsymbol{x_1})}) K(\boldsymbol{x_2}, \boldsymbol{\theta}_{\pi_j(\boldsymbol{x_2})})| p_i(\boldsymbol{x_1}) p_j(\boldsymbol{x_2}). \tag{S-2.2}$$

Now if this is an integrable random variable, we may take the expectation of (S-2.1) inside the summation sign and obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
E\left(f(\boldsymbol{x_1}) f(\boldsymbol{x_2})\right) &= E\left(\int K(\boldsymbol{x_1}, \boldsymbol{\theta}) dG_{\boldsymbol{x_1}}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \int K(\boldsymbol{x_2}, \boldsymbol{\theta}) dG_{\boldsymbol{x_2}}(\boldsymbol{\theta})\right) \\
&= \sum_i \sum_j E\left(K(\boldsymbol{x_1}, \boldsymbol{\theta}_{\pi_i(\boldsymbol{x_1})}) K(\boldsymbol{x_2}, \boldsymbol{\theta}_{\pi_j(\boldsymbol{x_2})})\right) E\left(p_i(\boldsymbol{x_1}) p_j(\boldsymbol{x_2})\right) \\
&= \sum_{\pi_i(\boldsymbol{x_1}) \neq \pi_j(\boldsymbol{x_2})} E\left(K(\boldsymbol{x_1}, \boldsymbol{\theta}_{\pi_i(\boldsymbol{x_1})}) K(\boldsymbol{x_2}, \boldsymbol{\theta}_{\pi_j(\boldsymbol{x_2})})\right) E\left(p_i(\boldsymbol{x_1}) p_j(\boldsymbol{x_2})\right) \\
&\quad + \sum_{\pi_i(\boldsymbol{x_1}) = \pi_j(\boldsymbol{x_2})} E\left(K(\boldsymbol{x_1}, \boldsymbol{\theta}_{\pi_i(\boldsymbol{x_1})}) K(\boldsymbol{x_2}, \boldsymbol{\theta}_{\pi_j(\boldsymbol{x_2})})\right) E\left(p_i(\boldsymbol{x_1}) p_j(\boldsymbol{x_2})\right) \\
&= \sum_{\pi_i(\boldsymbol{x_1}) \neq \pi_j(\boldsymbol{x_2})} E\left(K(\boldsymbol{x_1}, \boldsymbol{\theta})\right) E\left(K(\boldsymbol{x_2}, \boldsymbol{\theta})\right) E\left(p_i(\boldsymbol{x_1}) p_j(\boldsymbol{x_2})\right) \\
&\quad + \sum_{\pi_i(\boldsymbol{x_1}) = \pi_j(\boldsymbol{x_2})} E\left(K(\boldsymbol{x_1}, \boldsymbol{\theta}) K(\boldsymbol{x_2}, \boldsymbol{\theta})\right) E\left(p_i(\boldsymbol{x_1}) p_j(\boldsymbol{x_2})\right) \\
&= E\left(K(\boldsymbol{x_1}, \boldsymbol{\theta})\right) E\left(K(\boldsymbol{x_2}, \boldsymbol{\theta}) \sum_{\pi_i(\boldsymbol{x_1}) \neq \pi_j(\boldsymbol{x_2})} E\left(p_i(\boldsymbol{x_1}) p_j(\boldsymbol{x_2})\right)\right. \\
&\quad \left. + E\left(K(\boldsymbol{x_1}, \boldsymbol{\theta}) K(\boldsymbol{x_2}, \boldsymbol{\theta})\right) \sum_{\pi_i(\boldsymbol{x_1}) = \pi_j(\boldsymbol{x_2})} E\left(p_i(\boldsymbol{x_1}) p_j(\boldsymbol{x_2})\right)\right. \\
&= E\left(K(\boldsymbol{x_1}, \boldsymbol{\theta})\right) E\left(K(\boldsymbol{x_2}, \boldsymbol{\theta})\right. \\
&\left[\sum_{\pi_i(\boldsymbol{x_1}) \neq \pi_j(\boldsymbol{x_2})} E\left(p_i(\boldsymbol{x_1}) p_j(\boldsymbol{x_2})\right) + \sum_{\pi_i(\boldsymbol{x_1}) = \pi_j(\boldsymbol{x_2})} E\left(p_i(\boldsymbol{x_1}) p_j(\boldsymbol{x_2})\right)\right] \\
&\quad + E\left(K(\boldsymbol{x_1}, \boldsymbol{\theta}) K(\boldsymbol{x_2}, \boldsymbol{\theta})\right) \sum_{\pi_i(\boldsymbol{x_1}) = \pi_j(\boldsymbol{x_2})} E\left(p_i(\boldsymbol{x_1}) p_j(\boldsymbol{x_2})\right) \\
&\quad - E\left(K(\boldsymbol{x_1}, \boldsymbol{\theta})\right) E\left(K(\boldsymbol{x_2}, \boldsymbol{\theta})\right) \sum_{\pi_i(\boldsymbol{x_1}) = \pi_j(\boldsymbol{x_2})} E\left(p_i(\boldsymbol{x_1}) p_j(\boldsymbol{x_2})\right)
\end{aligned}$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
&= \operatorname{Cov}\left(K(\boldsymbol{x_1},\boldsymbol{\theta}), K(\boldsymbol{x_2},\boldsymbol{\theta})\right) \sum_{\pi_i(\boldsymbol{x_1})=\pi_j(\boldsymbol{x_2})} E\left(p_i(\boldsymbol{x_1})p_j(\boldsymbol{x_2})\right) \\
&\quad + E\left(K(\boldsymbol{x_1},\boldsymbol{\theta})\right) E\left(K(\boldsymbol{x_2},\boldsymbol{\theta})\right) \left[\sum_{\pi_i(\boldsymbol{x_1}),\pi_j(\boldsymbol{x_2})} E\left(p_i(\boldsymbol{x_1})p_j(\boldsymbol{x_2})\right) \right] \\
&= \operatorname{Cov}\left(K(\boldsymbol{x_1},\boldsymbol{\theta}), K(\boldsymbol{x_2},\boldsymbol{\theta})\right) \sum_{\pi_i(\boldsymbol{x_1})=\pi_j(\boldsymbol{x_2})} E\left(p_i(\boldsymbol{x_1})p_j(\boldsymbol{x_2})\right) \\
&\quad + E\left(K(\boldsymbol{x_1},\boldsymbol{\theta})\right) E\left(K(\boldsymbol{x_2},\boldsymbol{\theta})\right).
\end{aligned}
$$

An analogous equation shows that (S-2.2) is bounded, since, by our assumption

$$
\int |K(\boldsymbol{x},\boldsymbol{\theta}) dG_0(\boldsymbol{\theta}) < \infty \text{ and } \int |K(\boldsymbol{x_1},\boldsymbol{\theta}) K(\boldsymbol{x_2},\boldsymbol{\theta})| dG_0(\boldsymbol{\theta}) < \infty.
$$

To obtain the complete analytical expression of $E\left(f(\boldsymbol{x_1})f(\boldsymbol{x_2})\right)$ we need to calculate $\sum_{\pi_i(\boldsymbol{x_1})=\pi_j(\boldsymbol{x_2})} E\left(p_i(\boldsymbol{x_1})p_j(\boldsymbol{x_2})\right)$. Define

$$
T(\boldsymbol{x_1},\boldsymbol{x_2}) = \{k| \text{ there exists } i,j \text{ such that } \pi_i(\boldsymbol{x_1}) = \pi_j(\boldsymbol{x_2}) = k\},
$$

for $k \in T(\boldsymbol{x_1},\boldsymbol{x_2})$. We further define $A_{lk} = \{\pi_j(\boldsymbol{x_l})|j < i \text{ where } \pi_i(\boldsymbol{x_l}) = k\}$, $S_k = A_{1k} \cap A_{2k}$ and $S'_k = A_{1k} \cup A_{2k} - S_k$.

Then it can be easily shown that

$$
\sum_{\pi_i(\boldsymbol{x_1})=\pi_j(\boldsymbol{x_2})} E\left(p_i(\boldsymbol{x_1})p_j(\boldsymbol{x_2})\right) = \frac{2}{(\alpha+1)(\alpha+2)} \sum_{k\in T(\boldsymbol{x_1},\boldsymbol{x_2})} \left(\frac{\alpha}{\alpha+2}\right)^{\#S_k} \left(\frac{\alpha}{\alpha+1}\right)^{\#S'_k}.
$$

Hence

$$
\begin{aligned}
\operatorname{Cov}(f(\boldsymbol{x_1}), f(\boldsymbol{x_2})) &= \operatorname{Cov}_{G_0}(K(\boldsymbol{x_1},\boldsymbol{\theta}), K(\boldsymbol{x_2},\boldsymbol{\theta})) \times \frac{2}{(\alpha+1)(\alpha+2)} \\
&\quad \times \sum_{k\in T(\boldsymbol{x_1},\boldsymbol{x_2})} \left(\frac{\alpha}{\alpha+2}\right)^{\#S_k} \left(\frac{\alpha}{\alpha+1}\right)^{\#S'_k}.
\end{aligned}
$$

■

S-3. PROOF OF THEOREM 4

In this context, it is more convenient to deal with the notation used in the context of Theorem 2. Note that $\|\boldsymbol{x}_1 - \boldsymbol{x}_2\| \to 0$ implies that $\#S_k \to (k-1)$, $\#S'_k \to 0$, and hence,

for any realization of the point process, $\mathrm{Corr}(G_{\boldsymbol{x}_1}, G_{\boldsymbol{x}_2}) = \sum_{k \in T(\boldsymbol{x}_1, \boldsymbol{x}_2)} \left(\frac{\alpha}{\alpha+2}\right)^{\#S_k} \left(\frac{\alpha}{\alpha+1}\right)^{\#S'_k} \to \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \left(\frac{\alpha}{\alpha+2}\right)^{k-1} = (\alpha+2)/2$. Since $\mathrm{Corr}_{G_0}(K(\boldsymbol{x}_1, \boldsymbol{\theta}), K(\boldsymbol{x}_2, \boldsymbol{\theta})) \to 1$ as $\|\boldsymbol{x}_1 - \boldsymbol{x}_2\| \to 0$, it follows that $\mathrm{Corr}(f(\boldsymbol{x}_1), f(\boldsymbol{x}_2)) \to 1$ as $\|\boldsymbol{x}_1 - \boldsymbol{x}_2\| \to 0$. On the other hand, as $\|\boldsymbol{x}_1 - \boldsymbol{x}_2\| \to \infty$, $\#T(\boldsymbol{x}_1, \boldsymbol{x}_2)$ is at most finite, $\#S_k \to 0$ and $\#S'_k \to \infty$. This implies that $\mathrm{Corr}(G_{\boldsymbol{x}_1}, G_{\boldsymbol{x}_2}) \to 0$, and hence, $\mathrm{Corr}(f(\boldsymbol{x}_1), f(\boldsymbol{x}_2)) \to 0$. Hence, by the dominated convergence theorem it follows that the unconditional correlation between $f(\boldsymbol{x}_1)$ and $f(\boldsymbol{x}_2)$ goes to 1 and 0, respectively, as $\|\boldsymbol{x}_1 - \boldsymbol{x}_2\| \to 0$ and $\|\boldsymbol{x}_1 - \boldsymbol{x}_2\| \to \infty$.

S-4. PROOF OF THEOREM 7

Since for each $\boldsymbol{x}$, $f(\boldsymbol{x}) = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} K(\boldsymbol{x}, \boldsymbol{\theta}_{\pi_i(\boldsymbol{x})}) p_i(\boldsymbol{x})$, each $\boldsymbol{x}$ must satisfy $\pi_k(\boldsymbol{x}) = i_k$, for every $k = 1, 2, \ldots$, where $i_k \in \{1, 2, \ldots\}$ ($i_k \neq i_{k'}$ for any $k \neq k'$), we must have $\boldsymbol{x} \in \cap_{k=1}^{\infty} A_{ki_k}$. For simplicity but without loss of generality let $i_k = k$ for $k = 1, 2, \ldots$. Then for $\boldsymbol{x} \in \cap_{k=1}^{\infty} A_{ki_k}$ it holds that $K(\boldsymbol{x}, \boldsymbol{\theta}_{\pi_i(\boldsymbol{x})}) = K(\boldsymbol{x}, \boldsymbol{\theta}_i)$ and $p_i(\boldsymbol{x}) = V_i \prod_{j<i}(1 - V_j) = p_i$, say. Then, for any arbitrary $\boldsymbol{x}_0$ in the interior of $\cap_{k=1}^{\infty} A_{kk}$, it holds almost surely that

$$\begin{aligned}
\lim_{\boldsymbol{x} \to \boldsymbol{x}_0} f(\boldsymbol{x}) &= \lim_{\boldsymbol{x} \to \boldsymbol{x}_0} \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} K(\boldsymbol{x}, \boldsymbol{\theta}_i) p_i \qquad \text{(S-4.1)} \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \lim_{\boldsymbol{x} \to \boldsymbol{x}_0} K(\boldsymbol{x}, \boldsymbol{\theta}_i) p_i \\
&\quad \text{[using (A1) and the dominated convergence theorem} \\
&\quad \text{following from the facts that } K(\cdot, \cdot) \text{ is bounded and } \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} p_i = 1.\text{]} \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} K(\boldsymbol{x}_0, \boldsymbol{\theta}_i) p_i \quad \text{[using (A2).]} \\
&= f(\boldsymbol{x}_0). \qquad \text{(S-4.2)}
\end{aligned}$$

Hence $f(\cdot)$ is almost surely continuous in the interior of $\cap_{k=1}^{\infty} A_{ki_k}$.

To prove mean square continuity first note that the dominated convergence theorem can be applied as before, using boundedness of $K(\cdot, \cdot)$ and the fact that $\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} p_i = 1$ to guarantee

that the following hold almost surely:

$$\lim_{\boldsymbol{x}\to\boldsymbol{x}_0} f(\boldsymbol{x})^2 = f(\boldsymbol{x}_0)^2, \tag{S-4.3}$$

$$\lim_{\boldsymbol{x}\to\boldsymbol{x}_0} f(\boldsymbol{x})f(\boldsymbol{x}_0) = f(\boldsymbol{x}_0)^2. \tag{S-4.4}$$

Combining (S-4.2), (S-4.3) and (S-4.4) implies that $(f(\boldsymbol{x}) - f(\boldsymbol{x}_0))^2 \to 0$ almost surely. Now since $f(\cdot)$ is bounded almost surely by M (follows from (A1) and the fact that $\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} p_i = 1$), $f(\cdot)^2$ and $f(\cdot)f(\boldsymbol{x}_0)$ are almost surely bounded as well. Hence, taking expectations and using the dominated convergence theorem using the boundedness of $(f(\boldsymbol{x})-f(\boldsymbol{x}_0))^2$, it follows that

$$\lim_{\boldsymbol{x}\to\boldsymbol{x}_0} E[f(\boldsymbol{x}) - f(\boldsymbol{x}_0)]^2 = 0.$$

Therefore, $f(\boldsymbol{x})$ is mean square continuous in the interior of $\cap_{k=1}^{\infty} A_{ki_k}$.

Let us now show that if $\boldsymbol{x}_0 \in \cap_{k=1}^{\infty} A_{k_k}$ lies at the boundary of A_{kk} for some k, then $f(\cdot)$ is almost surely discontinuous at $\boldsymbol{x}_0$. It is useful to note that for each k, $\pi_k(\cdot)$ is a step function and admits the representation

$$\pi_k(\boldsymbol{x}) = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} i I_{A_{ki}}(\boldsymbol{x}).$$

For the sake of clarity, without loss of generality, let us assume that the dimensionality $d = 1$, so that $\boldsymbol{x}_0 = x_0$ is one-dimensional. Let us further assume, without loss of generality, that x_0 falls on the rightmost boundary of $A_{11} = \{x : \pi_1(x) = 1\}$, so that $x_0 = \sup\{x : \pi_1(x) = 1\}$. Then, almost surely,

$$\lim_{x\downarrow x_0} f(x) = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} K(x, \boldsymbol{\theta}_{i+1}) p_{i+1} \neq \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} K(x, \boldsymbol{\theta}_i) p_i = f(x_0),$$

showing that $f(\cdot)$ is almost surely discontinuous at x_0. ■

S-5. PROOF OF THEOREM 9

Without loss of generality, let $\boldsymbol{x}_0$ be an arbitrary point in the interior of $\cap_{k=1}^{\infty} A_{kk}$. Then, for any direction $\boldsymbol{u}$ such that $\boldsymbol{x} = \boldsymbol{x}_0 + \boldsymbol{u} \in \mathcal{N}(\boldsymbol{x}_0) \cap \{\cap_{k=1}^{\infty} A_{kk}\}$, where $\mathcal{N}(\boldsymbol{x}_0)$ is any neighborhood of $\boldsymbol{x}_0$,

$$f(\boldsymbol{x}) = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} K(\boldsymbol{x}, \boldsymbol{\theta}_i) p_i \tag{S-5.1}$$

and for each $i = 1, 2, \ldots$, $K(\boldsymbol{x}, \boldsymbol{\theta}_i)$ admits the following (multivariate) Taylor's series expansion:

$$K(\boldsymbol{x}_0 + \boldsymbol{u}, \boldsymbol{\theta}_i) = K(\boldsymbol{x}_0, \boldsymbol{\theta}_i) + \boldsymbol{u}' \bigtriangledown K(\boldsymbol{x}_0, \boldsymbol{\theta}_i) + R(\boldsymbol{x}_0, \boldsymbol{u}, \boldsymbol{\theta}_i) \tag{S-5.2}$$

where, $|R(\boldsymbol{x}_0, \boldsymbol{u}, \boldsymbol{\theta}_i)| \leq c(\boldsymbol{x}_0, \boldsymbol{\theta}_i)\|\boldsymbol{u}\|^2$, for some function $c(\cdot, \cdot)$, independent of $\boldsymbol{u}$. The boundedness assumption (B1) guarantees that $c(\cdot, \cdot)$ is bounded above by some finite constant M_1. Hence, for $i = 1, 2, \ldots$,

$$R(\boldsymbol{x}_0, \boldsymbol{u}, \boldsymbol{\theta}_i) \leq M_1\|\boldsymbol{u}\|^2. \tag{S-5.3}$$

It follows from (S-5.2) that

$$f(\boldsymbol{x}) = f(\boldsymbol{x}_0) + \boldsymbol{u}' \bigtriangledown f(\boldsymbol{x}_0) + R_2(\boldsymbol{x}_0, \boldsymbol{u}), \tag{S-5.4}$$

where

$$f(\boldsymbol{x}_0) = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} K(\boldsymbol{x}_0, \boldsymbol{\theta}_i)p_i$$

$$\bigtriangledown f(\boldsymbol{x}_0) = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \bigtriangledown K(\boldsymbol{x}_0, \boldsymbol{\theta}_i)p_i$$

$$R_2(\boldsymbol{x}_0, \boldsymbol{u}) = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} R(\boldsymbol{x}_0, \boldsymbol{u}, \boldsymbol{\theta}_i)p_i$$

In (S-5.4) $\boldsymbol{u}' \bigtriangledown f(\boldsymbol{x}_0)$ is clearly a process linear in $\boldsymbol{u}$. Moreover, since $\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} p_i = 1$, $|R_2(\boldsymbol{x}_0, \boldsymbol{u})|$ is bounded above by $M_1\|\boldsymbol{u}\|^2$. Hence, almost surely, $\frac{|R_2(\boldsymbol{x}_0, \boldsymbol{u})|}{\|\boldsymbol{u}\|} \to 0$. Hence, using the dominated convergence theorem it follows that

$$\lim_{\|\boldsymbol{u}\| \to 0} E\left[\frac{f(\boldsymbol{x}_0 + \boldsymbol{u}) - f(\boldsymbol{x}_0) - \boldsymbol{u}' \bigtriangledown f(\boldsymbol{x}_0)}{\|\boldsymbol{u}\|}\right]^2 = \lim_{\|\boldsymbol{u}\| \to 0} E\left[\frac{R(\boldsymbol{x}_0, \boldsymbol{u})}{\|\boldsymbol{u}\|}\right]^2 = 0.$$

Hence, $f(\cdot)$ is mean square differentiable in the interior of $\cap_{k=1}^{\infty} A_{ki_k}$. ■

S-6. PROOF OF THEOREM 10

For our purpose, we first state and prove a lemma.

Lemma 11 *Let p_k denote the random weights from an ODDP. For each positive integer $N \geq 1$ and each positive integer $r \geq 1$, let*

$$T_N(r,\alpha) = \left(\sum_{k=N}^{\infty} p_k\right)^r, \; U_N(r,\alpha) = \sum_{k=N}^{\infty} p_k^r.$$

Then

$$E(T_N(r,\alpha)) = \left(\frac{\alpha}{\alpha+r}\right)^{N-1},$$

and

$$E(U_N(r,\alpha)) = \left(\frac{\alpha}{\alpha+r}\right)^{N-1} \frac{\Gamma(r)\Gamma(\alpha+1)}{\Gamma(\alpha+r)}.$$

Proof. Let $\mathcal{P}$ be a specific random measure from ODDP. Then

$$\mathcal{P}(\cdot) = V_{\pi_1}\delta_{\theta_{\pi_1}}(\cdot) + (1-V_{\pi_1})\left(V^*_{\pi_1}\delta_{\theta^*_{\pi_1}}(\cdot) + (1-V^*_{\pi_1})V^*_{\pi_2}\delta_{\theta^*_{\pi_2}}(\cdot) + (1-V^*_{\pi_1})(1-V^*_{\pi_2})V^*_{\pi_3}\delta_{\theta^*_{\pi_3}}(\cdot) + \cdots\right),$$

where $V^*_{\pi_k} = V_{\pi_{k+1}}$ are independent $Beta(1,\alpha)$ random variables and $\theta^*_{\pi_k} = \theta_{\pi_{k+1}}$ are *iid* G_0. So we have

$$\mathcal{P}(\cdot) \stackrel{\mathcal{D}}{=} V_{\pi_1}\delta_{\theta_{\pi_1}}(\cdot) + (1-V_{\pi_1})\mathcal{P}^*(\cdot),$$

where $V_{\pi_1}, \theta_{\pi_1}$ and $\mathcal{P}^*(\cdot)$ are independent and $\mathcal{P}^*(\cdot)$ is an ODDP.

Similarly we can show that

$$U_1(r,\alpha) \stackrel{\mathcal{D}}{=} V^r_{\pi_1} + (1-V_{\pi_1})^r U_1(r,\alpha),$$

where on the right-hand side V_{π_1} and $U_1(r,\alpha)$ are mutually independent. Therefore taking expectations

$$E(U_1(r,\alpha)) = \frac{\Gamma(r+1)\Gamma(\alpha+1)}{\Gamma(\alpha+r+1)} + \frac{\alpha}{\alpha+r}E(U_1(r,\alpha)).$$

Then we have

$$E(U_1(r,\alpha)) = \frac{\Gamma(r)\Gamma(\alpha+1)}{\Gamma(\alpha+r)}. \tag{S-6.1}$$

Furthermore for $N \geq 2$, we have that

$$U_N(r,\alpha) = (1-V_{\pi_1})^r \cdots (1-V_{\pi_{(N-1)}})^r (U_1(r,\alpha)),$$

where all the variables on the right hand side are mutually independent. Taking expectations, we have

$$E(U_N(r,\alpha)) = \left(\prod_{k=1}^{N-1} E(1-V_{\pi_k})^r\right) E((U_1(r,\alpha))).$$

Then using (S-6.1) we have

$$E(U_N(r,\alpha)) = \left(\frac{\alpha}{\alpha+r}\right)^{N-1} \frac{\Gamma(r)\Gamma(\alpha+1)}{\Gamma(\alpha+r)}.$$

Now, similarly we can show that

$$\begin{aligned} T_N(r,\alpha) &\stackrel{\mathcal{D}}{=} (1-V_{\pi_1})^r \cdots (1-V_{\pi_{(N-1)}})^r (T_1(r,\alpha)) \\ &= (1-V_{\pi_1})^r \cdots (1-V_{\pi_{(N-1)}})^r \\ &= \left(\frac{\alpha}{\alpha+r}\right)^{N-1}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, the lemma is proved. ■

We now proceed to the proof of Theorem 10. Note that

$$\begin{aligned} & |m_N(\boldsymbol{y}) - m_\infty(\boldsymbol{y})| \\ &= \left| \int_\Theta [\boldsymbol{y}|P_N][P]d\Theta - \int_\Theta [\boldsymbol{y}|P][P]d\Theta \right| \\ &\leq \int_\Theta |[\boldsymbol{y}|P_N] - [\boldsymbol{y}|P]|\,[P]d\Theta \end{aligned} \tag{S-6.2}$$

Now we expand $[\boldsymbol{y}|P_N]$ around P using multivariate Taylor's series expansion up to the second order:

$$[\boldsymbol{y}|P_N] = [\boldsymbol{y}|P] + \left.\frac{\partial[\boldsymbol{y}|P_N]}{\partial P_N}\right|_{P_N=P} (P_N - P) + (P_N - P)' \left.\frac{\partial^2[\boldsymbol{y}|P_N]}{\partial P_N^2}\right|_{P_N=P^*} (P_N - P),$$

[where P^* lies between P and P_N, that is, $\|P - P^*\| \leq \|P - P_N\|$.]

Noting that $[\boldsymbol{y}|P_N]$ and $[\boldsymbol{y}|P_N]$ are multivariate normal densities with mean P_N and P respectively and variance $\sigma^2 I$, where I is the $n \times n$ identity matrix, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \left.\frac{\partial[\boldsymbol{y}|P_N]}{dP_N}\right|_{P_N=P} &= [\boldsymbol{y}|P](\boldsymbol{y}-P)', \quad \text{and} \\ \left.\frac{\partial^2[\boldsymbol{y}|P_N]}{\partial P_N^2}\right|_{P_N=P^*} &= [\boldsymbol{y}|P^*]I(\boldsymbol{y}-P^*)(\boldsymbol{y}-P^*)'I - [\boldsymbol{y}|P^*]I. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore (S-6.2) becomes

$$\int |[\boldsymbol{y}|P](\boldsymbol{y}-P)'(P_N-P)+(P_N-P)'[\boldsymbol{y}|P^*](\boldsymbol{y}-P^*)(\boldsymbol{y}-P^*)'(P_N-P) \\ -(P_N-P)'[\boldsymbol{y}|P^*]I(P_N-P)|\,[P]d\Theta.$$

So, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} |m_N(\boldsymbol{y})-m_\infty(\boldsymbol{y})|\,d\boldsymbol{y} \\
&\le \int_{\mathbb{R}^n}\int |[\boldsymbol{y}|P](\boldsymbol{y}-P)'(P_N-P)+(P_N-P)'[\boldsymbol{y}|P^*](\boldsymbol{y}-P^*)(\boldsymbol{y}-P^*)'(P_N-P) \\
&\qquad -(P_N-P)'[\boldsymbol{y}|P^*]I(P_N-P)|\,[P]d\Theta.
\end{aligned}$$

Now, using Fubini's theorem we can interchange the order of integration. Finally we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_{\mathbb{R}^n}\int |[\boldsymbol{y}|P](\boldsymbol{y}-P)'(P_N-P)+(P_N-P)'[\boldsymbol{y}|P^*](\boldsymbol{y}-P^*)(\boldsymbol{y}-P^*)'(P_N-P) \\
&\qquad -(P_N-P)'[\boldsymbol{y}|P^*]I(P_N-P)|\,[P]d\Theta d\boldsymbol{y} \\
&= \int\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} |[\boldsymbol{y}|P](\boldsymbol{y}-P)'(P_N-P)+(P_N-P)'[\boldsymbol{y}|P^*](\boldsymbol{y}-P^*)(\boldsymbol{y}-P^*)'(P_N-P) \\
&\qquad -(P_N-P)'[\boldsymbol{y}|P^*]I(P_N-P)|\,d\boldsymbol{y}[P]d\Theta \\
&\le \int \left[\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} [\boldsymbol{y}|P]\,|(\boldsymbol{y}-P)'(P_N-P)|\,d\boldsymbol{y}\right. \\
&\qquad \left. +\int_{\mathbb{R}^n}(P_N-P)'\left\{[\boldsymbol{y}|P^*](\boldsymbol{y}-P^*)(\boldsymbol{y}-P^*)'+[\boldsymbol{y}|P^*]I\right\}(P_N-P)d\boldsymbol{y}\right][P]d\Theta \\
&= \int \left[\sqrt{\frac{2}{\pi}}\mathbf{1}'_{n\times 1}|P_N-P|+2(P_N-P)'I(P_N-P)\right][P]d\Theta \\
&= E_\Theta\left[\sqrt{\frac{2}{\pi}}\mathbf{1}'_{n\times 1}|P_N-P|+2(P_N-P)'(P_N-P)\right] \\
&= 2E_\Theta\left[\sqrt{\frac{2}{\pi}}\sum_{i=1}^n |P_N(\boldsymbol{x}_i)-P(\boldsymbol{x}_i)|+\sum_{i=1}^n (P_N(\boldsymbol{x}_i)-P(\boldsymbol{x}_i))^2\right]. \qquad \text{(S-6.3)}
\end{aligned}$$

In the above, $\mathbf{1}_{n\times 1}$ denotes the n-component vector with each element 1. Now,

$$|P_N(\boldsymbol{x}_i)-P(\boldsymbol{x}_i)| \le M\left|p_N^N(\boldsymbol{x}_i)-p_N^\infty(\boldsymbol{x}_i)-\sum_{i=N+1}^\infty p_i(\boldsymbol{x}_i)\right|,$$

where $p_N^N(\boldsymbol{x}_i) = 1 - \sum_{k=1}^{N-1} p_k(\boldsymbol{x}_i) = 1 - \sum_{k=1}^{N-1} V_{\pi_k(\boldsymbol{x}_i)} \prod_{j<k} \left(1 - V_{\pi_j(\boldsymbol{x}_i)}\right)$ and $p_N^\infty(\boldsymbol{x}_i) = V_{\pi_N(\boldsymbol{x}_i)} \prod_{j<N} \left(1 - V_{\pi_j(\boldsymbol{x}_i)}\right)$ are the random weights corresponding to the N-th coefficient in the Sethuraman construction of truncated ODDP and the original ODDP respectively. We also have

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\left(P_N(\boldsymbol{x}_i) - P(\boldsymbol{x}_i)\right)^2 \\
&\leq M^2 \left(p_N^N(\boldsymbol{x}_i) - p_N^\infty(\boldsymbol{x}_i) - \sum_{i=N+1}^{\infty} p_i(\boldsymbol{x}_i) \right)^2 \\
&= M^2 \left[\left(p_N^N(\boldsymbol{x}_i) - p_N^\infty(\boldsymbol{x}_i)\right)^2 + \left(\sum_{i=N+1}^{\infty} p_i(\boldsymbol{x}_i) \right)^2 + 2 \left(p_N^N(\boldsymbol{x}_i) - p_N^\infty(\boldsymbol{x}_i)\right) \left(\sum_{i=N}^{\infty} p_i(\boldsymbol{x}_i) \right) \right].
\end{aligned}
$$

Therefore

$$
\begin{aligned}
&E_\Theta \left[\sum_{i=1}^{n} \left| P_N(\boldsymbol{x}_i) - P(\boldsymbol{x}_i) \right| \right] \\
&\leq \sum_{i=1}^{n} E_\Theta M \left[\left| p_N^N(\boldsymbol{x}_i) - p_N^\infty(\boldsymbol{x}_i) \right| + \sum_{i=N+1}^{\infty} p_i(\boldsymbol{x}_i) \right],
\end{aligned}
$$

and

$$
\begin{aligned}
&E_\Theta \left[\sum_{i=1}^{n} \left(P_N(\boldsymbol{x}_i) - P(\boldsymbol{x}_i)\right)^2 \right] \\
&\leq \sum_{i=1}^{n} E_\Theta M^2 \left[\left(p_N^N(\boldsymbol{x}_i) - p_N^\infty(\boldsymbol{x}_i)\right)^2 + \left(\sum_{i=N+1}^{\infty} p_i(\boldsymbol{x}_i) \right)^2 + 2 \left(p_N^N(\boldsymbol{x}_i) - p_N^\infty(\boldsymbol{x}_i)\right) \left(\sum_{i=N+1}^{\infty} p_i(\boldsymbol{x}_i) \right) \right]
\end{aligned}
$$

Now,

$$
\begin{aligned}
E\left(\left| p_N^N(\boldsymbol{x}_i) - p_N^\infty(\boldsymbol{x}_i) \right| \right) &= E\left[(1 - V_{\pi_1})(1 - V_{\pi_2}) \cdots (1 - V_{\pi_N}) \right] \\
&= \left(\frac{\alpha}{\alpha + 1} \right)^N \quad \text{Since } V_i\text{'s are } iid\ Beta(1, \alpha) \text{ random variables.}
\end{aligned} \tag{S-6.4}
$$

Similarly, we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
E(p_N^N(\boldsymbol{x}_i) - p_N^\infty(\boldsymbol{x}_i))^2 &= E\left[(1 - V_{\pi_1})(1 - V_{\pi_2}) \cdots (1 - V_{\pi_N}) \right]^2 \\
&= \left(\frac{\alpha}{\alpha + 2} \right)^N.
\end{aligned} \tag{S-6.5}
$$

Now, using Theorem 11 we have

$$E_\Theta\left(\sum_{i=N+1}^{\infty} p_i(\boldsymbol{x}_i)\right) = \left(\frac{\alpha}{\alpha+1}\right)^N, \tag{S-6.6}$$

and

$$E_\Theta\left(\sum_{i=N+1}^{\infty} p_i(\boldsymbol{x}_i)\right)^2 = \left(\frac{\alpha}{\alpha+2}\right)^N. \tag{S-6.7}$$

Now,

$$\begin{aligned}
&E_\Theta\left[2\left(p_N^N(x_i) - p_N^\infty(x_i)\right)\left(\sum_{i=N+1}^{\infty} p_i(x_i)\right)\right] \\
&= 2E(1-V_{\pi_1})(1-V_{\pi_2})\cdots(1-V_{\pi_N})\sum_{i=N+1}^{\infty}(1-V_{\pi_1})(1-V_{\pi_2})\cdots(1-V_{\pi_N})\cdots(1-V_{\pi_{i-1}})V_{\pi_i} \\
&= 2\left(\frac{\alpha}{\alpha+2}\right)^N\sum_{i=N}^{\infty}\left(\frac{\alpha}{\alpha+1}\right)^{i-N-1}\left(\frac{1}{\alpha+1}\right) \\
&= 2\left(\frac{\alpha}{\alpha+2}\right)^N.
\end{aligned} \tag{S-6.8}$$

So, combining (S-6.5), (S-6.6), (S-6.7) and (S-6.8) we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{i=1}^{n} E_\Theta M^2\left[\left(p_N^N(\boldsymbol{x}_i) - p_N^\infty(\boldsymbol{x}_i)\right)^2 + \left(\sum_{i=N+1}^{\infty} p_i(\boldsymbol{x}_i)\right)^2 + 2\left(p_N^N(\boldsymbol{x}_i) - p_N^\infty(\boldsymbol{x}_i)\right)\left(\sum_{i=N+1}^{\infty} p_i(\boldsymbol{x}_i)\right)\right] \\
&= 4M^2 n\left(\frac{\alpha}{\alpha+2}\right)^N.
\end{aligned} \tag{S-6.9}$$

Therefore, combining (S-6.4) and (S-6.7) with (S-6.9) finally we have

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} |m_N(\boldsymbol{y}) - m_\infty(\boldsymbol{y})|\, d\boldsymbol{y} \leq 4M^2 n\left(\frac{\alpha}{\alpha+2}\right)^N + 2\sqrt{\frac{2}{\pi}}Mn\left(\frac{\alpha}{\alpha+1}\right)^N,$$

thus completing the proof. ■

S-7. TRANSDIMENSIONAL TRANSFORMATION BASED MARKOV CHAIN MONTE CARLO (TTMCMC)

In order to obtain a valid algorithm based on transformations, Dutta & Bhattacharya (2014) design appropriate "move types" so that detailed balance and irreducibility hold. We first illustrate the basic idea on transformation based moves with a simple example. Given that

we are in the current state x, we may propose the "forward move" $x' = x + \epsilon$, where $\epsilon > 0$ is a simulation from some arbitrary density $g(\cdot)$ which is supported on the positive part of the real line. To move back to x from x', we need to apply the "backward transformation" $x' - \epsilon$. In general, given ϵ and the current state x, we shall denote the forward transformation by $T(x, \epsilon)$, and the backward transformation by $T^b(x, \epsilon)$. For fixed ϵ the forward and the backward transformations must be one to one and onto, and satisfy $T^b(T(x, \epsilon), \epsilon) = x = T(T^b(x, \epsilon), \epsilon)$; see Dutta & Bhattacharya (2014) for a detailed discussion regarding these.

The simple idea discussed above has been generalized to the multi-dimensional situation by Dutta & Bhattacharya (2014). Remarkably, for any dimension, the moves can be constructed by simple deterministic transformations of the one-dimensional random variable ϵ, which is simulated from any arbitrary distribution on some relevant support.

The idea based on transformations has been generalized to the case of variable dimensionality by Das & Bhattacharya (2014*b*). In other words, Das & Bhattacharya (2014*b*) show that using simple deterministic transformations and a single ϵ (or just a few ϵ's) it is possible to devise an effective dimension-hopping algorithm which changes dimension as well as updates the other parameters, all in a single block, while maintaining, at the same time, high acceptance rate. In this sense this new methodology accomplishes automation of move-types. Das & Bhattacharya (2014*b*) refer to this dimension changing methodology as Transdimensional Transformation based Markov Chain Monte Carlo (TTMCMC).

Before we illustrate the key concept of TTMCMC with a simple example, it is necessary to define some requisite notation, borrowed from Dutta & Bhattacharya (2014).

S-7.1 Notation

Suppose now that $\mathcal{X}$ is a k-dimensional space of the form $\mathcal{X} = \prod_{i=1}^{k} \mathcal{X}_i$ so that $T = (T_1, \ldots, T_k)$ where each $T_i : \mathcal{X}_i \times \mathcal{D} \to \mathcal{X}_i$, for some set $\mathcal{D}$, are the component-wise transformations. Let $\boldsymbol{\zeta} = (\zeta_1, \ldots, \zeta_k)$ be a vector of indicator variables, where, for $i = 1, \ldots, k$, $\zeta_i = 1$ and $\zeta_i = -1$ indicate, respectively, application of forward transformation and backward transformation to x_i, and let $\zeta_i = 0$ denote no change to x_i. Given any such indicator

vector $\boldsymbol{\zeta}$, let us define $T_{\boldsymbol{\zeta}} = (g_{1,\zeta_1}, g_{2,\zeta_2}, \ldots, g_{k,\zeta_k})$ where

$$g_{i,\zeta_i} = \begin{cases} T_i^b & \text{if} \quad \zeta_i = -1 \\ x_i & \text{if} \quad \zeta_i = 0 \\ T_i & \text{if} \quad \zeta_i = 1. \end{cases}$$

Corresponding to any given $\boldsymbol{\zeta}$, we also define the following 'conjugate' vector $\boldsymbol{\zeta}^c = (\zeta_1^c, \zeta_2^c, \ldots, \zeta_k^c)$, where

$$\zeta_i^c = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if} \quad \zeta_i = -1 \\ 0 & \text{if} \quad \zeta_i = 0 \\ -1 & \text{if} \quad \zeta_i = 1. \end{cases}$$

With this definition of $\boldsymbol{\zeta}^c$, $T_{\boldsymbol{\zeta}^c}$ can be interpreted as the conjugate of $T_{\boldsymbol{\zeta}}$.

Since 3^k values of $\boldsymbol{\zeta}$ are possible, it is clear that T, via $\boldsymbol{\zeta}$, induces 3^k many types of 'moves' of the forms $\{T_{\boldsymbol{\zeta}_i}; i = 1, \ldots, 3^k\}$ on the state-space. Suppose now that there is a subset $\mathcal{Y}$ of $\mathcal{D}$ such that the sets $T_{\boldsymbol{\zeta}_i}(\mathbf{x}, \mathcal{Y})$ and $T_{\boldsymbol{\zeta}_j}(\mathbf{x}, \mathcal{Y})$ are disjoint for every $\boldsymbol{\zeta}_i \neq \boldsymbol{\zeta}_j$. In fact, $\mathcal{Y}$ denotes the support of the distribution $g(\cdot)$ from which ϵ is simulated.

S-7.2 Illustration of TTMCMC with a simple example

Let us now illustrate the main idea of TTMCMC informally using the additive transformation. Although the example we illustrate TTMCMC with is borrowed from Das & Bhattacharya (2014*b*), the algorithm we now present is somewhat different from that of Das & Bhattacharya (2014*b*). Assume that the current state is $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, x_2) \in \mathbb{R}^2$. We first randomly select $u = (u_1, u_2, u_3) \sim Multinomial(w_b, w_d, w_{nc})$, where w_b, w_d, w_{nc} (> 0) such that $w_b + w_d + w_{nc} = 1$ are the probabilities of birth, death, and no-change moves, respectively. That is, if $u_1 = 1$, then we increase the dimensionality from 2 to 3; if $u_2 = 1$, then we decrease the dimensionality from 2 to 1, and if $u_3 = 1$, then we keep the dimensionality unchanged. In the latter case, when the dimensionality is unchanged, the acceptance probability remains the same as in TMCMC, as provided in Algorithm 3.1 of Dutta & Bhattacharya (2014).

If $u_1 = 1$, we can increase the dimensionality by first selecting one of x_1 and x_2 with probability $1/2$ – assuming for clarity that x_1 has been selected, we then construct the move-

type $T_{b,\boldsymbol{\zeta}}(\mathbf{x},\epsilon) = (x_1 + a_1\epsilon, x_1 - a_1\epsilon, x_2 + \zeta_2 a_2\epsilon) = (g_{1,\zeta_1=1}(x_1,\epsilon),\ g_{1,\zeta_1^c=-1}(x_1,\epsilon),\ g_{2,\zeta_2}(x_2,\epsilon))$, say. Here, as in TMCMC, we draw $\epsilon \sim g(\cdot)$, where $g(\cdot)$ is supported on the positive part of the real line, and draw $\zeta_2 = 1$ with probability p_2 and $\zeta_2 = -1$ with probability $1 - p_2$. Note that the value $\zeta_2 = 0$ is redundant for additive transformation (see Dutta & Bhattacharya (2014) for the details) and so is omitted here. We re-label $\mathbf{x}' = T_{b,\boldsymbol{\zeta}}(\mathbf{x},\epsilon) = (x_1 + a_1\epsilon, x_1 - a_1\epsilon, x_2 + \zeta_2 a_2\epsilon)$ as (x_1', x_2', x_3'). Thus, $T_{b,\boldsymbol{\zeta}}(\mathbf{x},\epsilon)$ increases the dimension from 2 to 3.

We accept this birth move with probability

$$a_b(\mathbf{x},\epsilon) = \min\left\{1, \frac{w_d}{w_b} \times \frac{p_2^{I_{\{1\}}(\zeta_2^c)} q_2^{I_{\{-1\}}(\zeta_2^c)}}{p_2^{I_{\{1\}}(\zeta_2)} q_2^{I_{\{-1\}}(\zeta_2)}} \times \frac{\pi(x_1 + a_1\epsilon,\ x_1 - a_1\epsilon,\ x_2 + \zeta_2 a_2\epsilon)}{\pi(x_1, x_2)} \times \left|\frac{\partial(T_{b,\boldsymbol{\zeta}}(\mathbf{x},\epsilon))}{\partial(\mathbf{x},\epsilon)}\right|\right\}. \tag{S-7.1}$$

In (S-7.1),

$$\left|\frac{\partial(T_{b,\boldsymbol{\zeta}}(\mathbf{x},\epsilon))}{\partial(\mathbf{x},\epsilon)}\right| = \left|\frac{\partial(x_1 + a_1\epsilon, x_1 - a_1\epsilon, x_2 + \zeta_2 a_2\epsilon)}{\partial(x_1, x_2, \epsilon)}\right| = \left|\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \\ a_1 & -a_1 & \zeta_2 a_2 \end{pmatrix}\right| = 2a_1. \tag{S-7.2}$$

Now let us illustrate the problem of returning to $=(x_1, x_2)$ $(\in \mathbb{R}^2)$ from $T_{b,\boldsymbol{\zeta}}(\mathbf{x},\epsilon) = (x_1 + a_1\epsilon, x_1 - a_1\epsilon, x_2 + \zeta_2 a_2\epsilon)$ $(\in \mathbb{R}^3)$. For our purpose, in this paper, we select one of the first two elements of $T_{b,\boldsymbol{\zeta}}(\mathbf{x},\epsilon)$ with the same probabiliuty. Suppose that we select $x_1 + a_1\epsilon$ with probability $1/2$. We then deterministically choose its right-adjacent $x_1 - a_1\epsilon$, and form the average $x_1^* = ((x_1 + a_1\epsilon) + (x_1 - a_1\epsilon))/2 = x_1$. For non-additive transformations we can consider the averages of the backward moves of of the selected element and its right-adjacent. Even in this additive transformation example, after simulating ϵ as before we can consider the respective backward moves of $x_1 + a_1\epsilon$ and $x_1 - a_1\epsilon$, both yielding x_1, and then take the average denoted by x_1^*. For the remaining element $x_2 + \zeta_2 a_2\epsilon$, we need to simulate ζ_2^c and then consider the move $(x_2 + \zeta_2 a_2\epsilon) + \zeta_2^c a_2\epsilon = x_2$. Thus, we can return to (x_1, x_2) using this strategy.

Letting $\mathbf{x}' = (x_1', x_2', x_3') = (x_1 + a_1\epsilon, x_1 - a_1\epsilon, x_2 + \zeta_2 a_2\epsilon)$, and denoting the average involving the first two elements by x_1^*, the death move is then given by $\mathbf{x}'' = T_{d,\boldsymbol{\zeta}}(\mathbf{x}',\epsilon) =$

$(x_1^*, x_3' + \zeta_2^c a_2\epsilon) = (\frac{x_1'+x_2'}{2}, x_3' + \zeta_2^c a_2\epsilon)$. Now observe that for returning to (x_1', x_2') from x_1^*, we must have $x^* + a_1\epsilon^* = x_1'$ and $x^* - a_1\epsilon^* = x_2'$, which yield $\epsilon^* = (x_1' - x_2')/2a_1$. Hence, the Jacobian associated with the death move in this case is given by

$$\left|\frac{\partial\left(T_{d,\boldsymbol{\zeta}}(\mathbf{x}',\epsilon),\epsilon^*,\epsilon\right)}{\partial(\mathbf{x}',\epsilon)}\right| = \left|\frac{\partial\left(\frac{x_1'+x_2'}{2}, x_3' + \zeta_2^c a_2\epsilon, \frac{x_1'-x_2'}{2a_1}, \epsilon\right)}{\partial(x_1', x_2', x_3', \epsilon)}\right| = \left|\begin{pmatrix} \frac{1}{2} & 0 & \frac{1}{2a_1} & 0 \\ \frac{1}{2} & 0 & -\frac{1}{2a_1} & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \zeta_2^c a_2 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}\right| = \frac{1}{2a_1}. \tag{S-7.3}$$

We accept this death move with probability

$$\begin{aligned} a_d(\mathbf{x}'', \epsilon, \epsilon^*) &= \min\left\{1, \frac{w_b}{w_d} \times \frac{P(\boldsymbol{\zeta}^c)}{P(\boldsymbol{\zeta})} \frac{\pi(\mathbf{x}'')}{\pi(\mathbf{x}'^{(t)})} \left|\frac{\partial(T_{d,\boldsymbol{\zeta}}(\mathbf{x}',\epsilon),\epsilon^*,\epsilon)}{\partial(\mathbf{x}',\epsilon)}\right|\right\} \\ &= \min\left\{1, 3 \times \frac{w_b}{w_d} \times \frac{p_2^{I_{\{1\}}(\zeta_2^c)} q_2^{I_{\{-1\}}(\zeta_2^c)}}{p_2^{I_{\{1\}}(\zeta_2)} q_2^{I_{\{-1\}}(\zeta_2)}} \times \frac{\pi(\mathbf{x}'')}{\pi(\mathbf{x}')} \times \frac{1}{2a_1}\right\}. \end{aligned}$$

In general, $\boldsymbol{x} \in \mathbb{R}^{mk}$ may be of the form $(\boldsymbol{x}_1, \boldsymbol{x}_2, \ldots, \boldsymbol{x}_m)$, where $\boldsymbol{x}_\ell = (x_{\ell,1}, x_{\ell,2}, \ldots, x_{\ell,k})$ for $\ell = 1, 2, \ldots, m$, where $m \geq 1$ is an integer. Let us assume that if the dimension of any one $\boldsymbol{x}_\ell$ is changed, then the dimensions of all other $\boldsymbol{x}_{\ell'};\ \ell' \neq \ell$ must also change accordingly. For instance, in our model,where we have summands with unknown number of components and the i-th component is characterized by the parameters associated with ODDP $(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{1i}, \boldsymbol{\theta}_{2i}, V_i, z_i)$, when the dimension of the current k-dimensional vector of the location parameter of the central distribution $(\theta_{11}, \ldots, \theta_{1k})$ is increased by one, then one must simultaneously increase the dimension of the other set of the current k-dimensional location parameter $(\theta_{21}, \ldots, \theta_{2k})$, the k-dimensional vector of the associated point process $(z_1, \ldots, z_k)$, as well as the k-dimensional mass vector $(V_1, \ldots, V_k)$ by one. In Section S-7.3 we present a TTMCMC algorithm (Algorithm S-7.1) for situations of this kind, and show that detailed balance holds (irreducibility and aperiodicity hold by the same arguments provided in Das & Bhattacharya (2014*b*)). It is worth mentioning that although Das & Bhattacharya (2014*b*) provide a TTMCMC algorithm for these situations (Algorithm 5.1 of their paper), their algorithm is somewhat different from ours in that, for the death move, we select only one element randomly; then

we choose the right-adjacent element; take backward transformations of both of them, finally taking the average. On the other hand, Das & Bhattacharya (2014*b*) select two elements randomly without replacement. This difference between the algorithm is reflected in the acceptance ratios – our algorithm is slightly simpler in that the random selection probabilities do not appear in our acceptance ratio, unlike that of Das & Bhattacharya (2014*b*).

S-7.3 General TTMCMC algorithm for jumping more than one dimensions at a time when several sets of parameters are related

Algorithm S-7.1 *General TTMCMC algorithm for jumping m dimensions with m related sets of co-ordinates.*

- Let the initial value be $\mathbf{x}^{(0)} \in \mathbb{R}^{mk}$, where $k \geq m$.
- For $t = 0, 1, 2, \ldots$
  1. Generate $u = (u_1, u_2, u_3) \sim Multinomial(1; w_{b,k}, w_{d,k}, w_{nc,k})$.
  2. If $u_1 = 1$ (increase dimension from mk to $(m+1)k$), then
     (a) Randomly select one co-ordinate from $\mathbf{x}_1^{(t)} = (x_{11}^{(t)}, \ldots, x_{1k}^{(t)})$ without replacement. Let j denote the chosen co-ordinate.
     (b) Generate $\boldsymbol{\epsilon}_m = (\epsilon_1, \ldots, \epsilon_m) \overset{iid}{\sim} g(\cdot)$ and for $i \in \{1, \ldots, k\} \backslash \{j\}$ simulate $\zeta_{\ell,i} \sim Multinomial(1; p_{\ell,i}, q_{\ell,i}, 1-p_{\ell,i}-q_{\ell,i})$ independently, for every $\ell = 1, \ldots, m$.
     (c) Propose the birth move as follows: for each $\ell = 1, \ldots, m$, apply the transformation $x_{\ell,i}^{(t)} \to g_{i,\zeta_{\ell,i}}(x_{\ell,i}^{(t)}, \epsilon_1)$ for $i \in \{1, \ldots, k\} \backslash \{j\}$ and, for each $\ell \in \{1, \ldots, m\}$, split $x_{\ell,j}^{(t)}$ into $g_{\ell,\zeta_{\ell,j}=1}(x_{\ell,j}^{(t)}, \epsilon_\ell)$ and $g_{\ell,\zeta_{\ell,j}^c=-1}(x_{\ell,j}^{(t)}, \epsilon_\ell)$. In other words, let $\boldsymbol{x}' = T_{b,\boldsymbol{\zeta}}(\mathbf{x}^{(t)}, \boldsymbol{\epsilon}_m) = (\boldsymbol{x}'_1, \ldots, \boldsymbol{x}'_m)$ denote the complete birth move, where, for $\ell = 1, \ldots, m$, $\boldsymbol{x}'_\ell$ is given by

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{x}'_\ell = (&g_{\ell,\zeta_{\ell,1}}(x_{\ell,1}^{(t)}, \epsilon_1), \ldots, g_{j-1,\zeta_{\ell,j-1}}(x_{\ell,j-1}^{(t)}, \epsilon_1),\\ &g_{j,\zeta_{\ell,j}=1}(x_{\ell,j}^{(t)}, \epsilon_\ell), g_{j,\zeta_{\ell,j}^c=-1}(x_{\ell,j}^{(t)}, \epsilon_\ell), g_{j+1,\zeta_{\ell,j+1}}(x_{\ell,j+1}^{(t)}, \epsilon_1), \ldots,\\ &\ldots, g_{k,\zeta_{\ell,k}}(x_{\ell,k}^{(t)}, \epsilon_1)).\end{aligned}$$

Re-label the $k+1$ elements of $\mathbf{x}'_\ell$ as $(x'_{\ell,1}, x'_{\ell,2}, \ldots, x'_{\ell,k+1})$.

(d) Calculate the acceptance probability of the birth move $\mathbf{x}'$:

$$a_b(\mathbf{x}^{(t)}, \boldsymbol{\epsilon}_m) = \min\left\{1, \frac{w_{d,k+1}}{w_{b,k}} \times \frac{P_{(j)}(\boldsymbol{\zeta}^c)}{P_{(j)}(\boldsymbol{\zeta})} \; \frac{\pi(\mathbf{x}')}{\pi(\mathbf{x}^{(t)})} \; \left|\frac{\partial(T_{b,\boldsymbol{\zeta}}(\mathbf{x}^{(t)}, \boldsymbol{\epsilon}_m))}{\partial(\mathbf{x}^{(t)}, \boldsymbol{\epsilon}_m)}\right|\right\},$$

where

$$P_{(j)}(\boldsymbol{\zeta}) = \prod_{\ell=1}^{m} \prod_{i \in \{1,\ldots,k\}\backslash\{j\}} p_{\ell,i}^{I_{\{1\}}(\zeta_{\ell,i})} q_{\ell,i}^{I_{\{-1\}}(\zeta_{\ell,i})},$$

and

$$P_{(j)}(\boldsymbol{\zeta}^c) = \prod_{\ell=1}^{m} \prod_{i \in \{1,\ldots,k\}\backslash\{j\}} p_{\ell,i}^{I_{\{1\}}(\zeta^c_{\ell,i})} q_{\ell,i}^{I_{\{-1\}}(\zeta^c_{\ell,i})}.$$

(e) Set

$$\mathbf{x}^{(t+1)} = \begin{cases} \mathbf{x}' & \text{with probability} \quad a_b(\mathbf{x}^{(t)}, \boldsymbol{\epsilon}_m) \\ \mathbf{x}^{(t)} & \text{with probability} \quad 1 - a_b(\mathbf{x}^{(t)}, \boldsymbol{\epsilon}_m). \end{cases}$$

3. If $u_2 = 1$ (decrease dimension from k to $k-m$, for $k \geq 2m$), then

(a) Generate $\boldsymbol{\epsilon}_m = (\epsilon_1, \ldots, \epsilon_m) \overset{iid}{\sim} g(\cdot)$.

(b) Randomly select one co-ordinate (say, the j-th co-ordinate) from $\boldsymbol{x}_1 = (x_{1,1}, \ldots, x_{1,k-1})$. For $\ell = 1, \ldots, m$, let

$$x^*_{\ell,j} = \left(g_{j,\zeta^c_{\ell,j}=-1}(x_{\ell,j}, \epsilon_\ell) + g_{j',\zeta_{\ell,j+1}=1}(x_{\ell,j+1}, \epsilon_\ell)\right)/2;$$

replace the co-ordinate $x_{\ell,j}$ by the average $x^*_{\ell,j}$ and delete $x_{\ell,j+1}$.

(c) Simulate $\boldsymbol{\zeta}$ by generating independently, for $\ell = 1, \ldots, m$ and for $i \in \{1, \ldots, k\}\backslash\{j, j+1\}$, $\zeta_{\ell,i} \sim Multinomial(1; p_{\ell,i}, q_{\ell,i}, 1 - p_{\ell,i} - q_{\ell,i})$.

(d) For $\ell = 1, \ldots, m$ and for $i \in \{1, \ldots, k\}\backslash\{j, j+1\}$, apply the transformation $x'_{\ell,i} = g_{i,\zeta_{\ell,i}}(x^{(t)}_{\ell,i}, \epsilon_1)$.

(e) Propose the following death move $\boldsymbol{x}' = T_{d,\boldsymbol{\zeta}}(\mathbf{x}^{(t)}, \boldsymbol{\epsilon}_m) = (\boldsymbol{x}'_1, \ldots, \boldsymbol{x}'_m)$ where for $\ell = 1, \ldots, m$, $\boldsymbol{x}_\ell$ is given by

$$\mathbf{x}'_\ell = (g_{1,\zeta_{\ell,1}}(x^{(t)}_{\ell,1}, \epsilon_1), \ldots, g_{j-1,\zeta_{\ell,j-1}}(x^{(t)}_{\ell,j-1}, \epsilon_1), x^*_{\ell,j}, g_{j+1,\zeta_{\ell,j+1}}(x^{(t)}_{\ell,j+1}, \epsilon_1),$$
$$\ldots, g_{k,\zeta_{\ell,k}}(x^{(t)}_{\ell,k}, \epsilon_1)).$$

Re-label the elements of $\mathbf{x}'_\ell$ as $(x'_{\ell,1}, x'_{\ell,2}, \ldots, x'_{\ell,k-1})$.

(f) For $\ell = 1, \ldots, m$, solve for ϵ_ℓ^* from the equations $g_{\ell,\zeta_{\ell,j}=1}(x_{\ell,j}^*, \epsilon_\ell^*) = x_{\ell,j}$ and $g_{\ell,\zeta_{\ell,j}^c=-1}(x_{\ell,j}^*, \epsilon_\ell^*) = x_{\ell,j+1}$ and express ϵ_ℓ^* in terms of $x_{\ell,j}$ and $x_{\ell,j+1}$. Let $\boldsymbol{\epsilon}_m^* = (\epsilon_1^*, \ldots, \epsilon_m^*)$.

(g) Calculate the acceptance probability of the death move:

$$a_d(\mathbf{x}^{(t)}, \boldsymbol{\epsilon}_m, \boldsymbol{\epsilon}_m^*) = \min\left\{1, \frac{w_{b,k-m}}{w_{d,k}} \times \frac{P_{(j,j+1)}(\boldsymbol{\zeta}^c)}{P_{(j,j+1)}(\boldsymbol{\zeta})} \; \frac{\pi(\mathbf{x}')}{\pi(\mathbf{x}^{(t)})} \; \left|\frac{\partial(T_{d,\boldsymbol{\zeta}}(\mathbf{x}^{(t)}, \boldsymbol{\epsilon}_m), \boldsymbol{\epsilon}_m^*, \boldsymbol{\epsilon}_m)}{\partial(\mathbf{x}^{(t)}, \boldsymbol{\epsilon}_m)}\right|\right\},$$

where

$$P_{(j,j+1)}(\boldsymbol{\zeta}) = \prod_{\ell=1}^{m} \prod_{i \in \{1,\ldots,k\}\setminus\{j,j+1\}} p_{\ell,i}^{I_{\{1\}}(\zeta_{\ell,i})} q_{\ell,i}^{I_{\{-1\}}(\zeta_{\ell,i})},$$

and

$$P_{(j,j+1)}(\boldsymbol{\zeta}^c) = \prod_{\ell=1}^{m} \prod_{i \in \{1,\ldots,k\}\setminus\{j,j+1\}} p_{\ell,i}^{I_{\{1\}}(\zeta_{\ell,i}^c)} q_{\ell,i}^{I_{\{-1\}}(\zeta_{\ell,i}^c)}.$$

(h) Set

$$\mathbf{x}^{(t+1)} = \begin{cases} \mathbf{x}' & \text{with probability} \quad a_d(\mathbf{x}^{(t)}, \boldsymbol{\epsilon}_m, \boldsymbol{\epsilon}_m^*) \\ \mathbf{x}^{(t)} & \text{with probability} \quad 1 - a_d(\mathbf{x}^{(t)}, \boldsymbol{\epsilon}_m, \boldsymbol{\epsilon}_m^*). \end{cases}$$

4. If $u_3 = 1$ (dimension remains unchanged), then implement steps (1), (2), (3) of Algorithm 3.1 of Dutta & Bhattacharya (2014).

- End for

S-7.4 Detailed balance

To see that detailed balance is satisfied for the birth and death moves, note that associated with the birth move, the probabilily of transition $\mathbf{x}$ ($\in \mathbb{R}^k$) $\mapsto T_{b,\boldsymbol{z}}(\mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\epsilon}_m)$ ($\in \mathbb{R}^{k+m}$), with

$k \geq m$, is given by:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\pi(\mathbf{x}) \times \frac{1}{k} \times w_{b,k} \times \prod_{\ell=1}^{m} g(\epsilon_\ell) \times \prod_{\ell=1}^{m} \prod_{i \in \{1,\ldots,k\}\setminus\{j\}} p_{\ell,i}^{I_{\{1\}}(\zeta_{\ell,i})} q_{\ell,i}^{I_{\{-1\}}(\zeta_{\ell,i})} \\
&\times \min\left\{1, \frac{w_{d,k+m}}{w_{b,k}} \times \frac{\prod_{\ell=1}^{m}\prod_{i\in\{1,\ldots,k\}\setminus\{j\}} p_{\ell,i}^{I_{\{1\}}(\zeta^c_{\ell,i})} q_{\ell,i}^{I_{\{-1\}}(\zeta^c_{\ell,i})}}{\prod_{\ell=1}^{m}\prod_{i\in\{1,\ldots,k\}\setminus\{j\}} p_{\ell,i}^{I_{\{1\}}(\zeta_{\ell,i})} q_{\ell,i}^{I_{\{-1\}}(\zeta_{\ell,i})}} \right. \\
&\qquad \left. \times \frac{\pi(T_{b,\boldsymbol{\zeta}}(\mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\epsilon}_m))}{\pi(\mathbf{x})} \times \left|\frac{\partial(T_{b,\boldsymbol{\zeta}}(\mathbf{x}^{(t)}, \boldsymbol{\epsilon}_m))}{\partial(\mathbf{x}^{(t)}, \boldsymbol{\epsilon}_m)}\right|\right\} \\
&= \frac{1}{k} \times \prod_{i=1}^{m} g(\epsilon_i) \times \min\left\{\pi(\mathbf{x}) \times w_{b,k} \times \prod_{\ell=1}^{m} \prod_{i\in\{1,\ldots,k\}\setminus\{j\}} p_{\ell,i}^{I_{\{1\}}(\zeta_{\ell,i})} q_{\ell,i}^{I_{\{-1\}}(\zeta_{\ell,i})}, \right. \\
&\qquad \left. \times w_{d,k+m} \times \prod_{\ell=1}^{m} \prod_{i\in\{1,\ldots,k\}\setminus\{j\}} p_{\ell,i}^{I_{\{1\}}(\zeta^c_{\ell,i})} q_{\ell,i}^{I_{\{-1\}}(\zeta^c_{\ell,i})} \pi(T_{b,\boldsymbol{\zeta}}(\mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\epsilon}_m)) \times \left|\frac{\partial(T_{b,\boldsymbol{\zeta}}(\mathbf{x}^{(t)}, \boldsymbol{\epsilon}_m))}{\partial(\mathbf{x}^{(t)}, \boldsymbol{\epsilon}_m)}\right|\right\}.
\end{aligned} \tag{S-7.4}$$

The transition probability of the reverse death move is given by:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\pi(\mathbf{x}) \times w_{d,k+m} \times \frac{1}{k} \times \prod_{\ell=1}^{m} g(\epsilon_\ell) \times \prod_{\ell=1}^{m} \prod_{i \in \{1,\ldots,k\}\setminus\{j\}} p_{\ell,i}^{I_{\{1\}}(\zeta^c_{\ell,i})} q_{\ell,i}^{I_{\{-1\}}(\zeta^c_{\ell,i})} \times \left|\frac{\partial(T^{-1}_{d,\boldsymbol{\zeta}}(\mathbf{x}^{(t)}, \boldsymbol{\epsilon}_m), \boldsymbol{\epsilon}^*_m, \boldsymbol{\epsilon}_m)}{\partial(\mathbf{x}^{(t)}, \boldsymbol{\epsilon}_m)}\right| \\
&\times \min\left\{1, \frac{w_{b,k}}{w_{d,k+m}} \times \frac{\prod_{\ell=1}^{m}\prod_{i\in\{1,\ldots,k\}\setminus\{j\}} p_{\ell,i}^{I_{\{1\}}(\zeta_{\ell,i})} q_{\ell,i}^{I_{\{-1\}}(\zeta_{\ell,i})}}{\prod_{\ell=1}^{m}\prod_{i\in\{1,\ldots,k\}\setminus\{j\}} p_{\ell,i}^{I_{\{1\}}(\zeta^c_{\ell,i})} q_{\ell,i}^{I_{\{-1\}}(\zeta^c_{\ell,i})}} \right. \\
&\qquad \left. \times \frac{\pi(\mathbf{x})}{\pi(T_{b,\boldsymbol{\zeta}}(\mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\epsilon}_m))} \times \left|\frac{\partial(T_{d,\boldsymbol{\zeta}}(\mathbf{x}^{(t)}, \boldsymbol{\epsilon}_m), \boldsymbol{\epsilon}^*_m, \boldsymbol{\epsilon}_m)}{\partial(\mathbf{x}^{(t)}, \boldsymbol{\epsilon}_m)}\right|\right\} \\
&= \frac{1}{k} \times \prod_{\ell=1}^{m} g(\epsilon_\ell) \times \min\left\{\pi(T_{b,\boldsymbol{\zeta}}(\mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\epsilon}_m)) \times w_{d,k+m} \times \prod_{\ell=1}^{m} \prod_{i\in\{1,\ldots,k\}\setminus\{j\}} p_{\ell,i}^{I_{\{1\}}(\zeta^c_{\ell,i})} q_{\ell,i}^{I_{\{-1\}}(\zeta^c_{\ell,i})} \right. \\
&\left. \times \left|\frac{\partial(T^{-1}_{d,\boldsymbol{\zeta}}(\mathbf{x}^{(t)}, \boldsymbol{\epsilon}_m), \boldsymbol{\epsilon}^*_m, \boldsymbol{\epsilon}_m)}{\partial(\mathbf{x}^{(t)}, \boldsymbol{\epsilon}_m)}\right|, w_{b,k} \times \prod_{\ell=1}^{m} \prod_{i\in\{1,\ldots,k\}\setminus\{j\}} p_{\ell,i}^{I_{\{1\}}(\zeta_{\ell,i})} q_{\ell,i}^{I_{\{-1\}}(\zeta_{\ell,i})} \times \pi(\mathbf{x})\right\}.
\end{aligned} \tag{S-7.5}$$

Noting that $\left|\frac{\partial(T^{-1}_{d,\boldsymbol{\zeta}}(\mathbf{x}^{(t)}, \boldsymbol{\epsilon}_m), \boldsymbol{\epsilon}^*_m, \boldsymbol{\epsilon}_m)}{\partial(\mathbf{x}^{(t)}, \boldsymbol{\epsilon}^*_m, \boldsymbol{\epsilon}_m)}\right| = \left|\frac{\partial(T_{b,\boldsymbol{\zeta}}(\mathbf{x}^{(t)}, \boldsymbol{\epsilon}_m))}{\partial(\mathbf{x}^{(t)}, \boldsymbol{\epsilon}_m)}\right|$, it follows that (S-7.4) = (S-7.5), showing that detailed balance holds for the birth and the death moves.

S-8. TTMCMC ALGORITHM FOR OUR SPATIO-TEMPORAL MODEL

We now specialize the general TTMCMC algorithm (Algorithm S-7.1) provided in Section S-7.3 in our spatio-temporal context. For our spatio temporal model, we need to update

the variable dimensional mass parameter $\boldsymbol{V} = (V_1, \ldots, V_k)$, the point process variables $\boldsymbol{z} = (z_1, \ldots, z_k)$, location parameters $\boldsymbol{\theta}_1 = (\theta_{11}, \ldots, \theta_{1k})$, the other set of location parameters $\boldsymbol{\theta}_2 = (\theta_{21}, \ldots, \theta_{2k})$, and fixed dimensional parameters α, λ, error variance σ and the parameters related to the kernel, namely, $\varphi, a_\delta, b_\psi$, $(\psi_1(\boldsymbol{s}_1), \ldots, \psi_1(\boldsymbol{s}_n))$, $(\psi_2(\boldsymbol{s}_1), \ldots, \psi_2(\boldsymbol{s}_n))$, $(\delta(t_1), \ldots, \delta(t_n))$, and τ. For updating the variable dimensional parameters we use proposed TTMCMC algorithm, and for fixed dimension we use the TMCMC algorithm of Dutta & Bhattacharya (2014). We denote by $\boldsymbol{\xi} = (\boldsymbol{V}, \boldsymbol{z}, \boldsymbol{\theta}_1, \boldsymbol{\theta}_2)$ the collection of all variable dimensional parameters and by $\boldsymbol{\eta} = (\varphi, a_\delta, b_\psi, \psi_1(\boldsymbol{s}_1), \ldots, \psi_1(\boldsymbol{s}_n),$
$\psi_2(\boldsymbol{s}_1), \ldots, \psi_2(\boldsymbol{s}_n), \delta(t_1), \ldots, \delta(t_n), \tau, \alpha, \lambda)$, the collection of all fixed dimensional parameters. The detailed updating procedure is provided as Algorithm S-8.1.

Algorithm S-8.1 *Detailed updating procedure of our spatio-temporal model*

- Initialise the number of components k; let $k^{(0)}$ be the chosen initial value (we chose $k^{(0)} = 15$ as the initial value for our applications).
- Given $k = k^{(0)}$, let $\boldsymbol{\xi}^{(0)}$ denote the initial value of $\boldsymbol{\xi}$. Also, let $\boldsymbol{\eta}^{(0)}$ denote the initial value of $\boldsymbol{\eta}$.
- Since $\boldsymbol{z}$ and $\boldsymbol{V}$ are constrained random variables, we consider updating the reparameterized versions $\boldsymbol{V}^* = \log(\boldsymbol{V})$ and $\boldsymbol{z}^* = \log\left(\frac{\boldsymbol{z}-a}{b-a}\right)$. After every iteration we invert the transformations to store the original variables $\boldsymbol{V}$ and $\boldsymbol{z}$. For the sake of convenience of presentation of our algorithm we slightly abuse notation by referring to $\boldsymbol{V}^*$ and $\boldsymbol{z}^*$ as $\boldsymbol{V}$ and $\boldsymbol{z}$ respectively.
- For $t = 0, 1, 2, \ldots$
  1. Generate $u = (u_1, u_2, u_3) \sim Multinomial\left(1; \frac{1}{3}, \frac{1}{3}, \frac{1}{3}\right)$.
  2. If $u_1 = 1$ (increase dimension from k to $k+1$ for each of the variables $\boldsymbol{V}, \boldsymbol{z}, \boldsymbol{\theta}_1, \boldsymbol{\theta}_2$), then
     (a) Randomly select one co-ordinate from $\{1, \ldots, k\}$. Let j denote the chosen co-ordinate.

(b) Generate $\boldsymbol{\epsilon}_5 = (\epsilon_1, \ldots, \epsilon_5) \overset{iid}{\sim} N(0,1)\mathbb{I}_{\{\epsilon>0\}}$ ($\mathbb{I}_{\{\epsilon>0\}}$ denoting the inidicator function). For updating the variable dimensional parameters, simulate

$$\zeta_{\ell,i}^{(1)} = \left\{ \begin{array}{lll} 1 & \text{w.p.} & \frac{1}{2} \\ -1 & \text{w.p.} & \frac{1}{2} \end{array} \right\} \text{for } i \in \{1,\ldots,k\}\backslash\{j\} \text{ and } \ \ell = 1,\ldots,4,$$

and for updating the fixed one dimensional parameters, simulate

$$\zeta_{\ell}^{(2)} = \left\{ \begin{array}{lll} 1 & \text{w.p.} & \frac{1}{2} \\ -1 & \text{w.p.} & \frac{1}{2} \end{array} \right\} \text{ for } \ell = 5,\ldots,10.$$

For updating fixed multi-dimensional parameters, simulate

$$\zeta_{\ell,i}^{(3)} = \left\{ \begin{array}{lll} 1 & \text{w.p.} & \frac{1}{2} \\ -1 & \text{w.p.} & \frac{1}{2} \end{array} \right\} \text{ for } \ \ i \in \{1,\ldots,n\} \text{ and } \ell = 11,12,13,14.$$

(c) Propose the birth move as follows. For $i \in \{1,\ldots,k\}\backslash\{j\}$, apply the additive transformation:

$V_i^{(t)} \to (V_i^{(t)} + \zeta_{1,i}^{(1)} a_1 \epsilon_1)$

$z_i^{(t)} \to (z_i^{(t)} + \zeta_{2,i}^{(1)} a_2 \epsilon_2)$

$\theta_{1i}^{(t)} \to (\theta_{1i}^{(t)} + \zeta_{3,i}^{(1)} a_3 \epsilon_3)$

$\theta_{2i}^{(t)} \to (\theta_{2i}^{(t)} + \zeta_{4,i}^{(1)} a_4 \epsilon_4)$

and split:

$V_j^{(t)}$ into $(V_j^{(t)} + a_1\epsilon_1)$ and $(V_j^{(t)} - a_1\epsilon_1)$

$z_j^{(t)}$ into $(z_j^{(t)} + a_2\epsilon_2)$ and $(z_j^{(t)} - a_2\epsilon_2)$

$\theta_{1j}^{(t)}$ into $(\theta_{1j}^{(t)} + a_3\epsilon_3)$ and $(\theta_{1j}^{(t)} - a_3\epsilon_3)$

$\theta_{2j}^{(t)}$ into $(\theta_{2j}^{(t)} + a_4\epsilon_4)$ and $(\theta_{2j}^{(t)} - a_4\epsilon_4)$

In other words, let $\boldsymbol{x}' = T_{b,\zeta^{(1)}}(\mathbf{x}^{(t)}, \boldsymbol{\epsilon}_m) = (\boldsymbol{V}', \boldsymbol{z}', \boldsymbol{\theta}_1', \boldsymbol{\theta}_2')$ denote the complete birth move, where,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{V}' = ((V_1^{(t)} + \zeta_{1,1}^{(1)} a_1\epsilon_1) \ldots (V_{j-1}^{(t)} + \zeta_{1,j-1}^{(1)} a_1\epsilon_1), (V_j^{(t)} + a_1\epsilon_1), (V_j^{(t)} - a_1\epsilon_1) \\ \ldots (V_k^{(t)} + \zeta_{1,k}^{(1)} a_1\epsilon_1)) \end{aligned} \tag{S-8.1}$$

$$\mathbf{z}' = ((z_1^{(t)} + \zeta_{2,1}^{(1)} a_2\epsilon_2) \ldots (z_{j-1}^{(t)} + \zeta_{2,j-1}^{(1)} a_2\epsilon_2), (z_j^{(t)} + a_2\epsilon_2), (z_j^{(t)} - a_2\epsilon_2) \ldots (z_k^{(t)} + \zeta_{2,k}^{(1)} a_2\epsilon_2)) \tag{S-8.2}$$

$$\boldsymbol{\theta}_1' = ((\theta_{1,1}^{(t)} + \zeta_{3,1}^{(1)} a_3\epsilon_3) \ldots (\theta_{1,j-1}^{(t)} + \zeta_{3,j-1}^{(1)} a_3\epsilon_3), (\theta_{1,j}^{(t)} + a_3\epsilon_3), (\theta_{1,j}^{(t)} - a_3\epsilon_3) \ldots (\theta_{1,k}^{(t)} + \zeta_{3,k}^{(1)} a_3\epsilon_3)) \tag{S-8.3}$$

$$\boldsymbol{\theta}_2' = ((\theta_{2,1}^{(t)} + \zeta_{4,1}^{(1)} a_4\epsilon_4) \ldots (\theta_{2,j-1}^{(t)} + \zeta_{4,j-1}^{(1)} a_4\epsilon_4), (\theta_{2,j}^{(t)} + a_4\epsilon_4), (\theta_{2,j}^{(t)} - a_4\epsilon_4) \ldots (\theta_{2,k}^{(t)} + \zeta_{4,k}^{(1)} a_4\epsilon_4)) \tag{S-8.4}$$

Re-label the $k+1$ elements of $\mathbf{V}'$ as $(V_1', V_2', \ldots, V_{k+1}')$, $\mathbf{z}'$ as $(z_1', z_2', \ldots, z_{k+1}')$, $\boldsymbol{\theta}_1'$ as $(\theta_{1,1}', \theta_{1,2}', \ldots, \theta_{1,k+1}')$, $\boldsymbol{\theta}_2'$ as $(\theta_{2,1}', \theta_{2,2}', \ldots, \theta_{2,k+1}')$.

(d) We apply the additive transformation based on the single ϵ_5 to update all the fixed dimensional parameter $\boldsymbol{\eta}$ as follows:

$\varphi^{(t)} \to (\varphi^{(t)} + \zeta_5^{(2)} a_5\epsilon_5)$

$a_\delta^{(t)} \to (a_\delta^{(t)} + \zeta_6^{(2)} a_6\epsilon_5)$

$b_\psi^{(t)} \to (b_\psi^{(t)} + \zeta_7^{(2)} a_7\epsilon_5)$

$\alpha^{(t)} \to (\alpha^{(t)} + \zeta_8^{(2)} a_8\epsilon_5)$

$\lambda^{(t)} \to (\lambda^{(t)} + \zeta_9^{(2)} a_9\epsilon_5)$

$\tau^{(t)} \to (\tau^{(t)} + \zeta_{10}^{(2)} a_{10}\epsilon_5)$

$\sigma^{(t)} \to (\sigma^{(t)} + \zeta_{11}^{(2)} a_{11}\epsilon_5)$

$\psi_1^{(t)}(\boldsymbol{s}_i) \to (\psi_1^{(t)}(\boldsymbol{s}_i) + \zeta_{12,i}^{(3)} a_{12}\epsilon_5)$

$\psi_2^{(t)}(\boldsymbol{s}_i) \to (\psi_2^{(t)}(\boldsymbol{s}_i) + \zeta_{13,i}^{(3)} a_{13}\epsilon_5)$

$\delta^{(t)}(t_i) \to (\delta^{(t)}(t_i) + \zeta_{14,i}^{(3)} a_{14}\epsilon_5)$

Let $\boldsymbol{\eta}' = T_{b,\zeta^{(2)}}(\boldsymbol{\eta}^{(t)}, \epsilon_5) = (\varphi', a'_\delta, b'_\psi, \psi'_1(\boldsymbol{s}_1), \ldots, \psi'_1(\boldsymbol{s}_n), \psi'_2(\boldsymbol{s}_1), \ldots, \psi'_2(\boldsymbol{s}_n), \delta'(t_1), \ldots, \delta'(t_n), \tau', \alpha', \lambda', \sigma')$ denote the complete move type for fixed dimensional parameters.

In the above transformations the a_i's are the scaling constants to be chosen appropriately; see Das & Bhattacharya (2014*b*) and Dey & Bhattacharya (2014) for the details. In our applications we choose the scales on the basis of pilot runs of our TTMCMC algorithm.

(e) Calculate the acceptance probability:

$$a_{b,\zeta}(\boldsymbol{\xi}^{(t)}, \boldsymbol{\eta}^{(t)}, \boldsymbol{\epsilon}_5) = \min\left\{1, \frac{\pi(\boldsymbol{\xi}', \boldsymbol{\eta}')}{\pi(\boldsymbol{\xi}^{(t)}, \boldsymbol{\eta}^{(t)})} \left|\frac{\partial(T_{b,\zeta^{(1)}}(\boldsymbol{\xi}^{(t)}, \boldsymbol{\epsilon}_4))}{\partial(\boldsymbol{\xi}^{(t)}, \boldsymbol{\epsilon}_4)}\right| \left|\frac{\partial(T_{b,\zeta^{(2)}}(\boldsymbol{\eta}^{(t)}, \epsilon_5))}{\partial(\boldsymbol{\eta}^{(t)}, \epsilon_5)}\right|\right\},$$

where

$$\frac{\partial(T_{b,\zeta^{(1)}}(\boldsymbol{\xi}^{(t)}, \boldsymbol{\epsilon}_4))}{\partial(\boldsymbol{\xi}^{(t)}, \boldsymbol{\epsilon}_4)} = 2^4 a_1 a_2 a_3 a_4$$

and

$$\frac{\partial(T_{b,\zeta^{(2)}}(\boldsymbol{\eta}^{(t)}, \epsilon_5))}{\partial(\boldsymbol{\eta}^{(t)}, e_5)} = 1.$$

(f) Set

$$(\boldsymbol{\xi}^{(t+1)}, \boldsymbol{\eta}^{(t+1)}) = \begin{cases} (\boldsymbol{\xi}', \boldsymbol{\eta}') & \text{with probability} \quad a_{b,\zeta}(\boldsymbol{\xi}^{(t)}, \boldsymbol{\eta}^{(t)}, \boldsymbol{\epsilon}_5), \\ (\boldsymbol{\xi}^{(t)}, \boldsymbol{\eta}^{(t)}) & \text{with probability} \quad 1 - a_{b,\zeta}(\boldsymbol{\xi}^{(t)}, \boldsymbol{\eta}^{(t)}, \boldsymbol{\epsilon}_5). \end{cases}$$

3. If $u_2 = 1$ (decrease dimension from k to $k-1$ for each of the variables $\boldsymbol{V}, \boldsymbol{z}, \boldsymbol{\theta}_1, \boldsymbol{\theta}_2$), then

(a) Generate $\boldsymbol{\epsilon}_5 = (\epsilon_1, \ldots, \epsilon_5) \overset{iid}{\sim} N(0,1)\mathbb{I}_{\{\epsilon > 0\}}$.

(b) Randomly select one co-ordinate from $\{1, 2, \ldots, k-1\}$. Let j be the selected co-ordinate. Then let

$$V_j^* = \left((V_j + a_1\epsilon_1) + (V_{j+1} - a_1\epsilon_1)\right)/2;$$

replace the co-ordinate V_j by the average V_j^* and delete V_{j+1}. Similarly, let

$$z_j^* = \left((z_j + a_2\epsilon_2) + (z_{j+1} - a_2\epsilon_2)\right)/2;$$

replace the co-ordinate z_j by the average z_j^* and delete z_{j+1}. Form

$$\theta_{1,j}^* = \left((\theta_{1,j} + a_3\epsilon_3) + (\theta_{1,j+1} - a_3\epsilon_3)\right)/2;$$

and replace the co-ordinate $\theta_{1,j}$ by the average $\theta_{1,j}^*$ and delete $\theta_{1,j+1}$; create

$$\theta_{2,j}^* = \left((\theta_{2,j} + a_4\epsilon_4) + (\theta_{2,j+1} - a_4\epsilon_4)\right)/2;$$

and replace the co-ordinate $\theta_{2,j}$ by the average $\theta_{2,j}^*$ and delete $\theta_{2,j+1}$.

(c) Simulate ζ similarly as in the case of the birth move.

(d) For the co-ordinates other than j and $j+1$ apply the additive transformation

$V_i^{(t)} \to (V_i^{(t)} + \zeta_{1,i}^{(1)} a_1\epsilon_1)$

$z_i^{(t)} \to (z_i^{(t)} + \zeta_{2,i}^{(1)} a_2\epsilon_2)$

$\theta_{1i}^{(t)} \to (\theta_{1i}^{(t)} + \zeta_{3,i}^{(1)} a_3\epsilon_3)$

$\theta_{2i}^{(t)} \to (\theta_{2i}^{(t)} + \zeta_{4,i}^{(1)} a_4\epsilon_4)$

for $i \in \{1, \ldots, k\} \backslash \{j, j+1\}$.

(e) In other words, let $\boldsymbol{\xi}' = T_{d,\zeta^{(1)}}(\boldsymbol{\xi}^{(t)}, \boldsymbol{\epsilon}_4) = (\boldsymbol{V}', \boldsymbol{z}', \boldsymbol{\theta}_1', \boldsymbol{\theta}_2')$ denote the complete death move, where,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{V}' = &((V_1^{(t)} + \zeta_{1,1}^{(1)} a_1\epsilon_1) \ldots (V_{j-1}^{(t)} + \zeta_{1,j-1}^{(1)} a_1\epsilon_1), V_j^*, (V_{j+2}^{(t)} + \zeta_{1,j+2}^{(1)} a_1\epsilon_1) \\ &\ldots (V_k^{(t)} + \zeta_{1,k}^{(1)} a_1\epsilon_1))\end{aligned} \tag{S-8.5}$$

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{z}' = &((z_1^{(t)} + \zeta_{2,1}^{(1)} a_2\epsilon_2) \ldots (z_{j-1}^{(t)} + \zeta_{2,j-1}^{(1)} a_2\epsilon_2), z_j^*, (z_{j+21}^{(t)} + \zeta_{2,j+21}^{(1)} a_2\epsilon_2), \\ &\ldots (z_k^{(t)} + \zeta_{2,k}^{(1)} a_2\epsilon_2))\end{aligned} \tag{S-8.6}$$

$$\begin{aligned}\boldsymbol{\theta}_1' = &((\theta_{1,1}^{(t)} + \zeta_{3,1}^{(1)} a_3\epsilon_3) \ldots (\theta_{1,j-1}^{(t)} + \zeta_{3,j-1}^{(1)} a_3\epsilon_3), \theta_{1,j}^*, (\theta_{1,j+2}^{(t)} + \zeta_{3,j+2}^{(1)} a_3\epsilon_3) \\ &\ldots (\theta_{1,k}^{(t)} + \zeta_{3,k}^{(1)} a_3\epsilon_3))\end{aligned} \tag{S-8.7}$$

$$\boldsymbol{\theta}_1' = ((\theta_{2,1}^{(t)} + \zeta_{4,1}^{(1)} a_4 \epsilon_4) \dots (\theta_{2,j-1}^{(t)} + \zeta_{4,j-1}^{(1)} a_4 \epsilon_4), \theta_{2,j}^*, (\theta_{2,j+2}^{(t)} + \zeta_{4,j+2}^{(1)} a_4 \epsilon_4) \dots (\theta_{2,k}^{(t)} + \zeta_{4,k}^{(1)} a_4 \epsilon_4)) \tag{S-8.8}$$

Re-label the $k-1$ elements of $\mathbf{V}'$ as $(V_1', V_2', \dots, V_{k-1}')$, $\mathbf{z}'$ as $(z_1', z_2', \dots, z_{k-1}')$, $\boldsymbol{\theta}_1'$ as $(\theta_{1,1}', \theta_{1,2}', \dots, \theta_{1,k-1}')$, and $\boldsymbol{\theta}_2'$ as $(\theta_{2,1}', \theta_{2,2}', \dots, \theta_{2,k-1}')$.

(f) Solve for ϵ_1^* from the equations $V_j^* + a_1\epsilon_1^* = V_j$ and $V_j^* - a_1\epsilon_1^* = V_{j+1}$, which yield $\epsilon_1^* = \frac{(V_j - V_{j+1})}{2a_1}$. Similarly, we have $\epsilon_2^* = \frac{(z_j - z_{j+1})}{2a_2}$ $\epsilon_3^* = \frac{(\theta_{1,j} - \theta_{1,j+1})}{2a_3}$ and $\epsilon_4^* = \frac{(\theta_{2,j} - \theta_{2,j+1})}{2a_4}$. Let $\boldsymbol{\epsilon}_4^* = (\epsilon_1^*, \dots, \epsilon_4^*)$.

(g) For updating the fixed dimensional parameters

$\boldsymbol{\eta} = (\varphi, a_\delta, b_\psi, \psi_1(\boldsymbol{s}_1), \dots, \psi_1(\boldsymbol{s}_n), \psi_2(\boldsymbol{s}_1), \dots, \psi_2(\boldsymbol{s}_n), \delta(t_1), \dots, \delta(t_n), \tau, \alpha, \lambda, \sigma)$

implement step 2 (d).

(h) Calculate the acceptance probability of the death move:

$$a_{d,\zeta}(\boldsymbol{\xi}^{(t)}, \boldsymbol{\eta}^{(t)}, \boldsymbol{\epsilon}_5, \boldsymbol{\epsilon}_4^*) = \min\left\{1, \ \frac{\pi(\boldsymbol{\xi}', \boldsymbol{\eta}')}{\pi(\boldsymbol{\xi}^{(t)}, \boldsymbol{\eta}^{(t)})} \ \left|\frac{\partial(T_{d,\zeta^{(1)}}(\boldsymbol{\xi}^{(t)}, \boldsymbol{\epsilon}_4), \boldsymbol{\epsilon}_4^*, \boldsymbol{\epsilon}_4)}{\partial(\boldsymbol{\xi}^{(t)}, \boldsymbol{\epsilon}_4)}\right| \ \left|\frac{\partial(T_{d,\zeta^{(2)}}(\boldsymbol{\eta}^{(t)}, \epsilon_5))}{\partial(\boldsymbol{\eta}^{(t)}, \epsilon_5)}\right|\right\},$$

where

$$\left|\frac{\partial(T_{d,\zeta^{(1)}}(\boldsymbol{\xi}^{(t)}, \boldsymbol{\epsilon}_4), \boldsymbol{\epsilon}_4^*, \boldsymbol{\epsilon}_4)}{\partial(\boldsymbol{\xi}^{(t)}, \boldsymbol{\epsilon}_4)}\right| = \frac{1}{2^4 a_1 a_2 a_3 a_4}$$

and

$$\frac{\partial(T_{d,\zeta^{(2)}}(\boldsymbol{\eta}^{(t)}, \epsilon_5))}{\partial(\boldsymbol{\eta}^{(t)}, \epsilon_5)} = 1.$$

(i) Set

$$(\boldsymbol{\xi}^{(t+1)}, \boldsymbol{\eta}^{(t+1)}) = \begin{cases} (\boldsymbol{\xi}', \boldsymbol{\eta}') & \text{with probability} \quad a_{d,\zeta}(\boldsymbol{\xi}^{(t)}, \boldsymbol{\eta}^{(t)}, \boldsymbol{\epsilon}_5, \boldsymbol{\epsilon}_4^*), \\ (\boldsymbol{\xi}^{(t)}, \boldsymbol{\eta}^{(t)}) & \text{with probability} \quad 1 - a_{d,\zeta}(\boldsymbol{\xi}^{(t)}, \boldsymbol{\eta}^{(t)}, \boldsymbol{\epsilon}_5, \boldsymbol{\epsilon}_4^*). \end{cases}$$

4. If $u_3 = 1$ (dimension remains unchanged),

   then update $(\boldsymbol{\xi}^{(t)}, \boldsymbol{\eta}^{(t)})$ by implementing steps (1), (2), (3) of Algorithm 3.1 of Dutta & Bhattacharya (2014).

- End for

REFERENCES

Banerjee, S., & Gelfand, A. E. (2003), "On Smoothness Properties of Spatial Processes," *Journal of Multivariate Analysis*, 84, 85100.

Chang, Y.-M., Hsu, N.-J., & Huang, H.-C. (2011), "Semiparametric Estimation and Selection for Nonstationary Spatial Covariance Functions," *Journal of COmputational and Graphical Statistics*, 19, 117–139.

Damian, D., Sampson, P. D., & Guttorp, P. (2001), "Bayesian Estimation of Semi-[arametric Non-stationary Spatial Covariance Structures," *Environmetrics*, 12, 161–178.

Das, M., & Bhattacharya, S. (2014*a*), "Supplement to "Nonstationary, Nonparametric, Nonseparable Bayesian Spatio-Temporal Modeling Using Kernel Convolution of Order Based Dependent Dirichlet Process",". Submitted.

Das, M., & Bhattacharya, S. (2014*b*), "Transdimensional Transformation Based Markov Chain Monte Carlo,". Submitted. Available at "http://arxiv.org/pdf/1403.5207".

Dey, K. K., & Bhattacharya, S. (2014), "On Optimal Scaling of Additive Transformation based Markov Chain Monte Carlo,". Submitted. Available at "http://arxiv.org/abs/1307.1446".

Duan, J. A., Gelfand, A. E., & Sirmans, C. F. (2009), "Modeling Space-Time Data Using Stochastic Differential Equations," *Bayesian Anslysis*, 4, 733–758.

Duan, J. A., Guindani, M., & Gelfand, A. E. (2007), "Generalized Spatial Dirichlet Process Models," *Biometrika*, 94, 809–825.

Dutta, S., & Bhattacharya, S. (2014), "Markov Chain Monte Carlo Based on Deterministic Transformations," *Statistical Methodology*, 16, 100–116. Also available at http://arxiv.org/abs/1106.5850. Supplement available at "http://arxiv.org/abs/1306.6684".

Ferguson, T. S. (1973), "A Bayesian Analysis of Some Nonparametric Problems," *The Annals of Statistics*, 1, 209–230.

Ferguson, T. S. (1974), "Prior Distributions on Spaces of Probability Measures," *The Annals of Statistics*, 2, 615–629.

Fuentes, M. (2002), "Spectral Methods for Nonstationary Spatial Processes," *Biometrika*, 89, 197–210.

Fuentes, M., & Smith, R. L. (2001), "A New Class of Nonstationary Spatial Models,". Technical Report, Department of Statistics, North Carolina State University.

Gelfand, A. E., Kottas, A., & MacEachern, S. N. (2005), "Bayesian Nonparametric Spatial Modeling With Dirichlet Process Mixing," *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 100, 1021–1035.

Griffin, J. E., & Steel, M. F. J. (2004), "Semiparametric Bayesian Inference for Stochastic Frontier Models," *Journal of Econometrics*, 123, 121–152.

Griffin, J. E., & Steel, M. F. J. (2006), "Order-Based Dependent Dirichlet Processes," *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 101, 179–194.

Guttorp, P., & Sampson, P. D. (1994), Methods for Estimating Heterogeneous Spatial Covariance Functions with Environmental Applications,, in *Handbook of Statistics XII: Environmental Statistics*, eds. G. P. Patil, & C. R. Rao, Elsevier/North Holland, New York, pp. 663–690.

Haas, T. C. (1995), "Local Prediction of a Spatio-Temporal Process with an Application to Wet Sulfate Deposition," *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 90, 11891199.

Higdon, D. (1998), "A Process-Convolution Approach to Modeling Temperatures in the North Atlantic Ocean," *Environmental and Ecological Statistics*, 5, 173190.

Higdon, D. (2001), Space and Space-Time Modeling Using Process Convolutions,, in *Quantitative Methods for Current Environmental Issues*, eds. C. W. A. V. Barnett, P. C. Chatwin, & A. H. El-Sharaawi, Springer-Verlag, London, pp. 37–56.

Higdon, D., Swall, J., & Kern, J. (1999), Non-Stationary Spatial Modeling,, in *Bayesian Statistics 6*, eds. J. M. Bernardo, J. O. Berger, A. P. Dawid, & A. F. M. Smith, Oxford University Press, Oxford, pp. 761–768.

Ishwaran, H., & James, L. F. (2001), "Gibbs Sampling Methods for Stick-Breaking Prior," *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 96, 161–173.

Nott, D. J., & Dunsmuir, W. T. M. (2002), "Estimation of Nonstationary Spatial Covariance Structure," *Biometrika*, 89, 819–829.

Sampson, P. D., & Guttorp, P. (1992), "Nonparametric Estimation of Nonstationary Spatial Covariance Structure," *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 87, 108119.

Schmidt, A. M., & O'Hagan, A. (2003), "Bayesian Inference for Nonstationary Spatial Covariance Structure via Spatial Deformations," *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society. Series B*, 65, 743758.

Sethuraman, J. (1994), "A constructive definition of Dirichlet priors," *Statistica Sinica*, 4, 639–650.

Stein, M. L. (1999), *Interpolation of Spatial Data: Some Theory for Kriging*, New York: Springer-Verlag.

Wolpert, R. L., Clyde, M. A., & Tu, C. (2011), "Stochastic Expansions Using Continuous Dictionaries: Lévy Adaptive Regression Kernels," *Annals of Statistics (to appear)*, .

Yaglom, A. M. (1987*a*), *Correlation Theory of Stationary and Related Random Functions–Volume-I: Basic Results*, New York: Springer-Verlag.

Yaglom, A. M. (1987*b*), *Correlation Theory of Stationary and Related Random Functions–Volume-II: Supplemtary Notes and References*, New York: Springer-Verlag.



Figure 10.1: Simulation study: Posterior predictive densities of $Y(\boldsymbol{s}, t)$ for 6 different location-time pairs – the corresponding true values are denoted by the vertical line.



Figure 10.2: Simulation study: Posterior densities of correlations for 12 different pairs of locations; the vertical lines indicate the true correlations.



Figure 10.3: Real data analysis: The top panel shows the surface plot of ozone concentrations (middle), the lower and the upper 95% credible intervals associated with the leave-one-out posterior predictive densities, denoted by the lower and the upper surfaces, respectively. The bottom panel shows the surface plot of the posterior medians (middle) along with the lower and the upper 95% credible intervals associated with the leave-one-out posterior predictive densities (lower and the upper surfaces, respectively). The observed data points are indicated by '*'.



Figure 10.4: Real data analysis: Posterior predictive distributions summarized by the median (middle line) and the 95% credible intervals as a function of $\boldsymbol{s}$. The observed data points are denoted by '*'.



Figure 10.5: Real data analysis: Posterior densities of correlations for 6 different pairs of locations.